CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.585
28 February 1991

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FIVE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-FIFTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 28 February 1991, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Carl-Magnus Hyltenius (Sweden)

GE.91-60416/3033B

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 585th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

Before we proceed with our business today, I wish to extend to the delegation of the Netherlands, as President of the Conference, our deep condolences on the loss of a distinguished and able diplomat, Mr. Robert Jan Akkerman, who served in the Conference between 1982 and 1985 and was, during his duties in Geneva, Chairman of Working Group B of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. Mr. Akkerman leaves behind him many friends who will always remember his competence and human qualities. I ask Ambassador Wagenmakers, to express our sorrow to his Government and to the family of the deceased.

I have on my list of speakers today the representatives of Chile and the United States of America, as well as the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events, who will introduce the progress report of the Ad Hoc Group, which was circulated today as document CD/1065. I now give the floor to the representative of Chile, Ambassador Tomic.

Mr. TOMIC (Chile) (translated from Spanish): Mr. President, allow me to extend to you and to Sweden, your noble country, which has preserved peace for more than a century and a half, the compliments of the delegation of Chile on whose behalf I speak.

The contradiction between the longing for peace eagerly shared by the vast majority of mankind, and the insane pace of the arms build-up - $2 million every minute! - and the blood-stained use of weapons on an increasingly threatening scale, particularly in the course of the last 50 years, forms the framework within which our deliberations on disarmament are taking place. It is indeed a strange framework, one which obliges us to reflect on the root cause of this contradiction that is so flagrant, so sustained, so alien to the essential identity of the whole of the human race.

True, 20 centuries ago St. Paul identified this contradiction in a sort of mystery of human nature, a mystery for which there is no ethical or rational explanation: "The good that I would I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do". True, the Romans coined the axiom Si vis pacem para bellum - if you seek peace, prepare for war. True, more than a century ago, one of the most influential statesmen in the destiny of Europe at the time, Bismarck coined the same phrase in his well-known dictum: "The alternatives are clear. A choice must be made between being the anvil or the hammer; beating or being beaten".

What is war and what are weapons, if not the most acute and unambiguous manifestation of the desire to dominate based on force, multiform in its origin and expression but always motivated by the intention of using coercion or the threat of coercion by one human over another, by one social group over other social groups in internal conflicts, by one State - the nations as juridically organized - over other States at the international level? War, and the weapons that are indispensable for it, are but the return to the animal instinct, which makes use of intelligence to enhance its depredatory power, ignoring all ethical values.

(Mr. Tomic, Chile)

I would like to conclude this preamble to my statement with a memory that I will never forget: the thrilling appeal made by Pope Paul VI in the plenary Assembly hall of the United Nations in New York, in which he was guest of honour and sole speaker. The number of highly distinguished figures and other people thronging together to hear Paul VI, this man of God, could hardly have been greater. The Pope had been invited to speak of peace and war. The power stemming from his own conviction that he was but the instrument of God progressively transformed the expectant silence with which he was initially received by the multitude into a kind of growing and fascinating vibration. He had no papers in his hands. And when he finished, he summed his whole speech up in a single sentence that was repeated time and again: "Lay down your weapons! Lay down your weapons!" The electrified crowd broke into endless applause, interspersed with the tears of some and the joy of others; and hope and gratitude on the part of all. For a long time they forgot whether they were athiests or believers, communists or capitalists, Russians or Americans, rich or poor, white or African or Asian. For that moment, we only knew - we only wanted to know! - that we were men and women united by the indestructable reality of being part of one single race - the human race; that they shared one single nature - human nature; and that their destiny could be realized only in plenitude, solidarity and brotherhood and not through the overt or concealed desire for the will to subjection or domination, which is the other name for weapons and wars.

As if lit by a flash of lightning, we all felt our thoughts to be interpreted by that thrilling appeal by the Pope: "Lay down your weapons!". But the lighting that rends the darkness of the night illuminates the Earth only for a few seconds. Almost 25 years have passed since this ecumenical experience in which I had the privilege of participating. What remains of it? To what did it lead? Only God can weigh it all up in a long-term historical perspective. We are all aware of the terrifying development of the deadly power of weapons, in this intermediate period which in these very days has cast a gloom over Europe, the Near and Far East, Africa and Asia, Latin America and Saxon America, not forgetting Oceania.

The blood that has been shed and the blood which may be shed in the near future, involving hundreds of thousands of human beings, the hunger which undermines the fundamental dignity of more than a billion men, women and children, and which is no longer the consequence of misforture, but in our time of injustice; the scandalous inequalities between the haves and have-nots (not only at the international level but also within one and the same country), the evil fruit of systematic selfishness and of profit and greed as the highest mechanisms regulating the unequal confrontation in world trade between those who control science and technology, capital and markets, production and productivity, and those who in contrast have minimal access to these factors, which are decisive in ensuring that "free competition", "free markets" and foreign borrowing that is direct (loans) or indirect (investment protected by special regulations that begin by requiring that investors are guaranteed good business and dependable profits) are not used to legitimize the unequal and unfair competition between the group of highly industrialized countries, enjoying per capita incomes of over $20 thousand a year and the two thirds of the "submerged humanity" of the underdeveloped countries with

(Mr. Tomic, Chile)

per capita incomes that hardly amount to $400 a year, according to the official documents that have been published by United Nations agencies themselves this very year.

This philosophy is anti-humanist because it involves the deliberate rejection of any ethical or moral concept, any standard of reference that begins by distinguishing between what is just and what is unjust, and opposes the indispensable pre-eminence that must be given to equity over the alleged automaticity of the "laws of the market" that have been the "slaughter house" of the legitimate rights and aspirations of the latecomers to the possession and control of scientific and technological progress and the levers of power that stem therefrom. As the Venezuelan Andrés Bello, the most brilliant, universal and disciplined mind produced by Latin America in the ninteenth century, taught, since everything is related to everything else on the plane of knowledge and human destiny, what is known as "national security", based on weapons and on preparations for war, cannot be separated from the set of problems that have divided the world into a minority of "victors" and a vast majority of "victims".

For the present Government of Chile, the promotion of human rights is not only a matter of legal relevance, but also of unquestionable political importance for the task of generating confidence and stability. All that, taking into account the new concepts of national security - it is not irrelevant here - and its international dimensions. If there is no resolute action undertaken to combat the essential and most important causes that are eroding this national security - everything is related to everything else - like the enormous and disproportionate spiralling of expenditure on weapons, the serious deterioration of the environment, economic dependence, the enormous external indebtedness of the poor countries of the world, the low levels of participation in scientific and technological development, scant negotiating capacity at the international level etc., etc., any agreement on disarmament confined to problems of weaponry will be built on very precarious foundations or will be unworkable in the face of the fundamental challenges of a stable and fair world required by mankind today.

It would not be right to conclude these thoughts without referring to the comprehensive proposal made by Pope John Paul II in his recent encyclical letter sollicitudo Rei Socialis, because it contains two elements that I wish to highlight, the negative judgement on what is happening today, but the opening of horizons for hope, the possibility that things can be different:

> "The serious disorder in the world is compounded by the tremendous and universally acknowledged danger represented by atomic weapons, stockpiled on an incredible scale. The logical conclusion is that in today's world, including the world of economics, the prevailing picture is one destined to lead all of us more quickly towards death rather than one which is channelled towards true development which would lead all towards a 'more human life', as envisaged by the Encyclical Populorum Progressio."

(Mr. Tomic, Chile)

But further on John Paul II underlines the positive option that the very crisis of today's disorder offers to the world of tomorrow, adding:

> "At the same time, in a world divided and beset by every type of conflict, the conviction is growing of a radical interdependence and consequently of the need for a solidarity which will take up interdependence and transfer it to the moral plane. Today perhaps more than in the past, people are realizing that they are linked together by a common destiny, which is to be constructed together, if catastrophe for all is to be avoided."

An overall evaluation of our Conference. This is the second theme of my statement this morning, which does not aim to be exhaustive but to mention, as we see them, from the point of view of the Chilian mission, some of the issues that affect us more particularly. The important agreements that have already been concluded in the area of arms reductions, especially in relation to nuclear weapons, are basically the result of bilateral negotiations between the great Powers and the military alliances each heads or headed; but it is essential for these encouraging processes to be complemented properly at the multilateral level, in order that the entire international community should be involved in a genuine process of disarmament that would cover not only highly destructive weapons, but also conventional weapons, which nowadays consume more than two thirds of expenditure on arms. In that context, the work of the Conference should be strengthened as it is the only multilateral forum in the United Nations system entrusted with negotiating agreements on disarmament. Obviously, the fundamental condition for progress lies in the indispensable political will of all the States represented here to participate substantively in the negotiations. But "political will" in turn is possible only when a common goal is shared; it is the known and desired objective that determines the means of attaining it because the conviction that disarmament is in the interests of the world community and all the States that make it up is the essential basis for successful negotiations in view of the fact that they will be of benefit to all parties, and not just a few.

Chile joined this Conference two years ago as a non-member State. From the point of view of my country, allow me to give a critical and respectfully intended assessment of its work. For too long, the Conference has been stagnating with regard to its main tasks; a negative situation which has just been demonstrated in the Gulf war. It seems to us that perhaps the main cause of this clear shortcoming lies in the group structure, which is an achronistic and inoperative in the context of "acceleration of history" which is changing the international scene at an extraordinary pace; a phenomenon which has not been reflected in perceptible changes in the assessment and the conduct of important delegations vis-à-vis the essential objectives which inspire or should inspire this special institution.

A tangible example of the foregoing is to be found in the decisions concerning procedures adopted by the Conference the Thursday before last. After four weeks of consultations, the Conference has recently been able to adopt decisions enabling the commencement of the work for this year, through the establishment of ad hoc committees entrusted with dealing with the different agenda items. The mandates given to these committees are frankly

(Mr. Tomic, Chile)

restrictive with regard to the potential for making progress in specific negotiations. In other cases agreement on the establishment of these working groups was not even possible, and it was decided to undertake informal consultations. In this regard we fully share the dissatisfaction voiced time and again in this room by the Group of 21 about the scope of the mandates given to these committees.

But the shortcomings are not only limited to the work of the committees. In general there is a very dangerous lack of transparency in the negotiations and in the decisions, owing to the repeated use made of "informal consultations" to which non-member States have no access. At the same time, the groups that exist here do not allow observer States to attend their internal discussions, thus preventing them from participating with suggestions or making contributions to negotiations which also concern them as well as the community of nations. Finally, it is upsetting that despite the many years that have gone by, the Conference has still not been able to settle the problem of its enlargement to include four more members - an aspiration which is shared by Chile and which prompted it to submit its candidature for membership. In short, we consider that the crisis caused by the disappearance of the bipolar world and the turbulence that accompanies the still confused emergence of a new international order, a proposal which is taking shape and being repeated as an absolute necessity from the highest levels of those who have the power to give this new international order shape, does not yet seem to have been assimilated within this Conference, nor is it reflected as a factor of the objectives and methods of the aforementioned new international order, within which a policy of disarmament is one of the main elements.

This is an assessment I am making from a strictly constructive and objective viewpoint, like several distinguished ambassadors of member countries who have done so in similar terms in this room. Thereby I wish to make it absolutely clear that my country is most interested in the success of this Conference. For the new Government of Chile it is a primordial aim to be reintegrated in the concert of nations, and among other initiatives it plans to participate actively in the Conference on Disarmament. For this purpose I wish to inform you that we have enlarged our delegation in order to be able to cover as many committees as possible, making useful contributions towards the common objective.

I would not wish to conclude this statement without referring briefly to the topics at the centre of the Conference's attention at its present session. I refer to chemical weapons, nuclear testing and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. As far as chemical weapons are concerned, my country has repeatedly advocated the prompt signature of a convention expressly prohibiting the production, stockpiling and use of this type of weapons, as well as the complete destruction of those that already exist. We said so in this forum in 1989, and also mentioned the fact at the ministerial conference in Paris. Unfortunately, the political drive that was generated at this latter important meeting has disappeared. My country considers that in order to attain the objective of banning these deadly weapons once and for all, the support of all nations or the great majority of them is necessary.

(Mr. Tomic, Chile)

Universality is an essential prerequisite. Destruction should be complete and immediate, and effective and transparent verification machinery must also be set up. Last December, in keeping with Chile's interest in contributing to the creation of the required climate of international confidence, my delegation circulated, document CD/1042, which constituted a response to the suggested outline for the multilateral exchange of basic data proposed by Germany. With regard to the destruction of stockpiles and its possible negative repercussions on the environment, we are interested in and support Peru's initiative for the inclusion in the draft convention of a chapter on the preservation and cleaning up of the environment. In fact, for several months certain delegations have been proposing a ministerial conference to be held in the near future to define the necessary political guidelines for the finalization of the negotiations. While supporting this idea, we would like to say that invitations to this Conference should in our view be addressed not only to the member States of the Conference on Disarmament, but also to observer States as well as those that are not in either of the two above categories, in order to try to make the convention truly universal.

In the area of nuclear testing, Chile supported the initiative submitted by Indonesia, Mexico, Peru, Sri Lanka, Venezuela and Yugoslavia to amend the Moscow Treaty and make progress towards a total nuclear text ban. We took this position on the basis of the following considerations: The commitment made by the nuclear Powers themselves to achieve substantial progress in favour of nuclear disarmament, in conformity with the provisions laid down in the preamble and in article IV of the partial test-ban Treaty; our concern about the prolongation and stagnation of these negotiations; the climate of greater security and confidence that has substantially reduced the risk of war between the super-Powers, and which has made it possible and necessary for the international community to act with greater political decisiveness; and finally, the concern of quite a number of countries, including Chile, with regard to the fact that the refusal to accept the complete cessation of tests may come to be interpreted as an expectation of the modernization of existing nuclear arsenals on the part of the nuclear Powers.

The results of the Amendment Conference held last January were rather meagre, in our view. Nevertheless, we think that it had the great merit of serving as a means to express a desire which has long been held by world public opinion, especially in those countries that have no nuclear weapons. Therefore we consider that the mandate given to the President of the Amendment Conference, to commence informal consultations on possible points of consensus, is encouraging. As the Conference on Disarmament is the sole forum for multilateral negotiations, the establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee last year was an important step and we only regret that for 1991 this group does not have a genuine negotiating mandate.

Chile's interest in participating actively in efforts designed to bring about a cessation of nuclear tests led it to apply last January to be allowed to participate in the committee of scientific experts to examine international co-operative measures to detect and identify seismic events. Drawing on the unenviable experience that our country, for geological reasons has built up in

(Mr. Tomic, Chile)

seismographic matters, I might add that our intention is not to co-operate only with the above-mentioned committee, but also in the GSETT-2 technical experiments which will take place between next April and May.

Finally, Chile has for many years been urging the need for legal controls on the peaceful uses of outer space, which should benefit all States. We are therefore concerned at the arms race in space, since instead of the search for co-operative aims the inevitable end result will be its continued militarization. The Conference should give the Ad Hoc Committee an adequate mandate to initiate substantive negotiations, without prejudice to the important task that has been entrusted to COPUOS in this field. Taking into account the importance of this topic, Chile circulated document CD/915 in 1989.

For all the foregoing reasons, my country attaches special importance to the Conference on Disarmament. A forum of this type, I repeat, cannot be a closed circle, when its decisions affect or have a bearing on the international community as a whole. Objectively speaking, peace, the supreme objective of the United Nations, is not the desire of just a few, but the aspiration of all. In this context, the Government of Chile feels the moral obligation to help to outline minimal conditions of justice and security corresponding to the democratic values that we regard as absolutely indispensable. Therefore we are ready to carry out measures of solidarity both regionally as well as internationally to strengthen the stability of countries and remove the threat of war. The present structure of this Conference is perhaps not conducive to these noble aims. For that reason we consider that there is an urgent need to restructure it so that all nations have an opportunity to join or at least express themselves on an equal footing.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Chile for his statement and for the kind words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of the United States of America, Ambassador Ledogar.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): I have a brief, procedural statement to make this morning, but since it is my first formal intervention this session, I would like to join with those who have already congratulated you, Mr. President, upon your assumption of the presidency for this part of the Conference's 1991 session. I would also like to welcome our new colleagues, recently arrived.

Last year in a statement to the Conference on Disarmament I said that the United States and the Soviet Union made important progress in the area of nuclear testing verification by the signing of the protocols to the threshold test-ban Treaty and the peaceful nuclear explosions Treaty. Both these protocols were made available informally to the members of the Ad Hoc Committee on agenda item 1 during their meeting of 9 August 1990.

Today I want to inform the Conference that the United States and the Soviet Union exchanged instruments of ratification and protocols for the two nuclear testing treaties in Houston, Texas, on 11 December 1990. I am at the same time requesting that the 1974 United States-USSR threshold test-ban Treaty and the 1976 United States-USSR peaceful nuclear explosions Treaty together with their respective protocols become official documents of the Conference on Disarmament.

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

Ratification and exchange of instruments brought into force the 1974 threshold test-ban Treaty and the 1976 peaceful nuclear explosions Treaty banning underground nuclear weapons tests with yields exceeding 150 kilotons. When President Bush signed the instruments of ratification he expressed the hope that the treaties "will lead to even more important advances in arms control and the preservation of world peace and security."

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United States of America for his statement and for the kind words addressed to the Chair. Before I invite Dr. Dahlman to take the floor, I should like to ask whether any delegation wishes to take the floor on matters other than the progress report of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts. I recognize the distinguished representative of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Ambassador Wagenmakers.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): I hope to express my feelings of congratulations in relation to your assumption of the Chair on another occasion.

Today I would like to thank the President of the Conference on Disarmament, on behalf of the Netherlands delegation, for his expression of condolence on the tragic death of our friend and colleague, Robert Jan Akkerman. I also thank the other colleagues who came to see us and shared our sorrow. It was with great shock and sadness that we learned about his murder in Tunis last night. The life of a talented young diplomat - he was 40 years of age - has come to an unforeseen end. In addition to his talents as a diplomat, both in the multilateral and in the bilateral context, Robert Jan was also a respected international lawyer in his own right. During his Geneva years he served, amongst other assignments, as Chairman of Working Group B of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, which at the time was presided over by the Ambassador of Sweden, Ambassador Ekéus. Further to that, he was a member of the Netherlands delegation to many General Assemblies of the United Nations. When I myself first joined the arms control and disarmament community in 1979, I found Robert Jan in the Chair of the main working body of the conference which prepared the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. At that moment he was 29 years of age. A promising career and a dedicated life has been finished in an untimely way.

Once again, I thank you, Mr. President, and all colleagues and friends who have shown their participation in our grief. I will not fail to transmit your and their condolences to the next of kin.

The PRESIDENT: I thank Ambassador Wagenmakers. Is there any other delegation that would like to take the floor before I give the floor to Dr. Dahlman? I see none. I now given the floor to the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts, Dr. Ola Dahlman, to introduce the Group's progress report on its thirty-first session.

Mr. DAHLMAN (Sweden): I am pleased to introduce today the progress report of the recent meeting of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts, contained in document CD/1065. This meeting, which was the thirty-first session of the Group, took place between 11 and 21 February 1991. Experts and representatives from 26 countries participated. Representatives from WMO participated during discussions on data communication. The Group enjoyed throughout the session the eminent services of the secretariat. This session was the last in a series of meetings to prepare for full-scale testing within the Group's Second Large Technical Test, usually referred to as GSETT-2. I can report today that we have now completed our preparatory work and have decided to conduct the full-scale test later this spring, from 22 April to 9 June 1991.

As part of GSETT-2, two preparatory tests have been conducted since our last session in August 1990. A data communication experiment conducted in October-November 1990 turned out to be most useful in sorting out a number of practical communication problems. A one-week trial experiment conducted between 26 November and 2 December 1990 involved not only data transmission but also seismic recording and data analysis at 24 national and 4 experimental international data centres (usually referred to as EIDCs). It showed that the procedures established for GSETT-2 with very few exceptions worked well and that in general they had been properly implemented in those countries which participated in the test. Also the communications between national and experimental international data centres and the high-speed connections among the EIDCs proved with few exceptions to function in a satisfactory way. The Group expects no particular difficulties in solving the few remaining technical problems. It is the opinion of the Group that the facilities that have been participating in the preparatory work and in the various trial tests are now well prepared for the full-scale testing.

Thus far, 28 countries have indicated their intention to establish national data centres and to participate in the upcoming main phase of GSETT-2. This participation is essential for the full-scale experiment. Several additional countries have expressed an interest in participating in GSETT-2 if the necessary arrangements can be completed in time for the start of the main phase. Such participation will improve the results of the experiment and is strongly encouraged. The Group expressed its appreciation for the efforts of Finland and Austria in supporting the participation of Zambia and Peru. The Ad Hoc Group has on a number of occasions stressed the importance of broadening participation in GSETT-2 to meet the objectives of the large-scale test.

One important purpose of GSETT-2 is to demonstrate that a global system can operate in the real environment, that is, cope with all the earthquakes that occur around the world. If large areas do not contribute data from any stations a large number of earthquakes will go undetected and this will reduce the actual load on the system and make the test a little bit less realistic and the results more difficult to assess. I still hope that more countries which so far have not joined the test will find it possible to do so. You can rely on the co-operation of the co-ordinator of GSETT-2, Mr. Basham of Canada, and myself in bringing about the necessary practical arrangements.

(Mr. Dahlman, Sweden)

As I have said before, this full-scale testing is a large undertaking involving hundreds of scientists, engineers and technicians at seismological centres and communication facilities around the world. To my knowledge this is the largest single multilateral experiment ever undertaken for the purpose of testing a component of a verification system for arms limitation and disarmament.

The actual conduct of this test is one important undertaking. To evaluate the results and to draw the relevant conclusions from these results is another important step which also requires careful planning. The Group discussed criteria for such an evaluation on the basis of material presented by a specially appointed study group. To allow for a comprehensive evaluation, pertinent information has to be collected systematically during the test, and the Group agreed on guidelines for the collection and compilation of the necessary information.

The material thus compiled and the experience gained at national and experimental international data centres will form the necessary basis for the evaluation of GSETT-2. This evaluation is not only aimed at clarifying the factual results of the test, it should further and most importantly provide an assessment of how these results will affect the design of the global system and what modifications, if any, need to be made to the preliminary design presented in March 1989 in the Group's fifth report (CD/903).

The Group believes it will be important for some facilities to remain available during 1992 to conduct additional tests that might be required for a successful evaluation of GSETT-2.

The Group intends to present a preliminary report on the results of GSETT-2 at its next session. The comprehensive report, including an analysis of the consequences of the results of GSETT-2 for the overall system design, will be submitted in 1992, hopefully as early as during the spring session.

Although the Group's attention is presently focused on the successful conduct of the full-scale test, the Group had a preliminary discussion on its activities beyond this test. A wide range of issues were raised in the Group during this discussion. One such issue was whether a global system should contain four international data centres or if one such centre would be sufficient. Most countries operate national seismological networks to monitor with high sensitivity the occurrence of local earthquakes on their territories. The question was raised if and how such locally recorded data could be used to assist in clarifying events observed by the global system. Also mentioned was the possibility of monitoring the oceans using hydroacoustic recordings, and the use of on-site inspections and satellite photos to assist in the interpretation of seismic events. It was further suggested that a system to monitor atmospheric radioactivity could utilize the same principles of design and technical and administrative infrastructure as the global seismological system.

There was general agreement in the Group that much valuable work could be conducted under its current mandate. The Group expects to take up this item again and develop specific suggestions based also on the results of the evaluation of GSETT-2.

(Mr. Dahlman, Sweden)

However, the Group considers that it would be useful to acquire further information on modern global satellite communications soon, and suggests that, on the understanding that there are no financial implications to the Conference on Disarmament, the International Maritime Satellite Organization (INMARSAT) should be invited to send a representative to the next session of the Group to discuss possibilities for the use of INMARSAT in the development of the communications aspect of a future global seismic data exchange system.

The Ad Hoc Group suggests that its next session, subject to approval by the Conference on Disarmament, should be convened from 29 July to 9 August 1991.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts for introducing the report appearing in document CD/1065. Does any member wish at this stage to address the progress report or comment on the work of the Ad Hoc Group? I recognize the distinguished Ambassador of Argentina.

Mr. GARCIA MORITAN (Argentina) (translated from Spanish): This morning the Conference on Disarmament received the report of the Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events. We are grateful to its Chairman, Dr. Ola Dahlman, for his presentation just now, which enables us to become a little more familiar with the content and the work of that scientific group. We have noted, inter alia, that the Chairman of the Group of seismic experts has felt compelled to clarify the scope of some terms of a political nature contained in the report. It is logical that that should be so, because the Group of Experts has a responsibility which is confined to the technical field and which consists precisely in considering international co-operation to detect and identify seismic events. Meanwhile, political assessments, as we all know, are a matter for the Ad Hoc Committee chaired by the distinguished Ambassador of India on the item of the nuclear test ban.

It is obvious that maybe political judgements are becoming increasingly necessary since it is difficult to understand the continuing delay in the initiation of appropriate negotiations on a treaty banning nuclear weapon tests once and for all. I think the time has come for the Group of seismic experts to carry out its work in harmony with what is taking place in the Ad Hoc Committee. I think that it can no longer continue to work without a political orientation. And consequently it is perhaps also necessary for the Conference to analyse its mandate to determine the appropriateness of linking its activity to political work, to see also whether the technical issues under its consideration are sufficient in respect of the verification of a nuclear test-ban treaty, whether it would be a complementary method and not a sole method in the task of verifying a treaty banning nuclear weapon tests. We consider that the task of the Group of seismic scientists is incontestably important. We are grateful to them for their efforts. Technicians from our delegation have at some time participated in analysing their work and we are certainly very grateful to them for their work. Now we will have to see what the political link is with the Ad Hoc Committee. We will also have to look at other methods of verification.

(Mr. Garcia Moritan, Argentina)

These are a few very preliminary comments to which my delegation intends to revert. We shall conduct a thorough analysis of the report contained in document CD/1065 to see whether we can find ourselves in a position to adopt it in due course.

The PRESIDENT: You will note that paragraph 15 of the progress report contains a recommendation concerning the next session of the Ad Hoc Group, to be convened from 29 July to 9 August 1991. I shall put that recommendation before the Conference for adoption at our next plenary meeting on Thursday, 7 March.

As regards paragraph 14, this contains a suggestion from the Ad Hoc Group that, on the understanding that there are no financial implications for the Conference the International Maritime Satellite Organization (INMARSAT) should be invited to send a representative to the next session of the Ad Hoc Group. The secretariat has circulated the draft of a letter that I, as President of the Conference, will address to the Director-General of that organization. I am thus complying with rule 11 of the rules of procedure, which provides that the President shall, in full consultation with the Conference and under its authority, represent it in its relations with other international organizations. If there are no objections to the text of the letter before the next plenary meeting, I shall then proceed to send the letter as drafted.

May I now turn to another subject? You will recall that at the opening of the annual session, we took a decision concerning participation by States non-members in the Conference's work. In connection with the informal meetings being held on the substance of agenda items 2 and 3, I have received communications from the representatives of Chile and Spain, making it clear that their original requests should be understood as also covering those informal meetings. In fact, the clarification from Chile has already been discussed at the informal meeting held last week on the substance of agenda item 2. As these clarifications are in order, if I hear no objection I shall take it that the clarifications received from the representatives of Chile and Spain enable them to participate additionally in the informal meetings relating to the substance of agenda items 2 and 3.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I also wish to inform you that I have received a communication from the Chairman of the Committee on Conferences, which oversees utilization of conference resources financed by the United Nations budget. In that communication, I am requested to inform the Conference of its contents as well as of the relevant provisions of General Assembly resolution 45/238 A of 21 December 1990. As the Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations made a statement on this question at our opening plenary meeting on 22 January, I will invite him to report to us on the letter that we have received. I now give the floor to Ambassador Komatina.

Mr. KOMATINA (Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations): In pursuance of General Assembly resolution 43/222 B, the Committee on Conferences is entrusted with responsibility for determining the ways and means that might ensure the optimum utilization of conference facilities, including documentation, and to monitor the implementation of all General Assembly resolutions on the organization and servicing of, and documentation for, conferences and meetings. Many recommendations from the Committee have been adopted as General Assembly resolutions aimed at improving the efficient and effective use of the conference resources available. The most recent resolution of the Assembly on this subject, resolution 45/238 A, inter alia, notes the efforts made by a number of organs to improve the utilization of conference-servicing resources; invites United Nations bodies, in making requests for conference services in accordance with their respective mandates, to ensure that the conference services requested are sufficient to enable them to carry out their tasks fully and match, to the extent possible, their actual requirements; and urges all organs and bodies to intensify their efforts to improve their utilization of requested conference-servicing resources.

The intent of this resolution, and those that preceded it, is to assist organs serviced by the Secretariat of the United Nations in making the best possible use of the conference-servicing resources provided to them without adversely affecting the successful work of the organs in question. This can be accomplished through a variety of means, such as eliminating as far as possible avoidable cancellations of meetings and other arrangements. The Chairman of the Committee on Conferences indicates that one way of reducing the number of avoidable cancellations would be to establish a timetable for the session based on past practices and patterns of the Conference as well as on the anticipated need for time for informal consultations or for processing of in-session documentation. He also notes that if the Secretariat is informed well in advance of cancellations, this increases the possibility of reassignment of conference-servicing resources to other bodies wishing to meet.

In view of the great importance accorded to the question of the improved utilization of conference-servicing resources, the General Assembly, in operative paragraphs 9 and 10 of resolution 45/238 A, requested the Chairman of the Committee on Conferences and the Secretary-General to maintain their contacts with all organs serviced by the United Nations Secretariat in order to ensure the most efficient and effective use of conference services allocated to them, and requested the presiding officers of those organs to bring the concerns about the utilization of conference-servicing resources to the attention of the organs concerned.

As you pointed out, Mr. President, I reported to the Conference at its 577th plenary meeting on the services to be assigned to it. I also informed the members that we were not using all the services assigned to us and gave the figures of the total of hours of full services lost during 1990. In fact, this is the only area where our utilization of available resources has not been very successful. As far as the other recommendations addressed to us by the Chairman of the Committee on Conferences are concerned, I believe that the programme of work adopted for the annual session, as well as the weekly timetable of meetings of the Conference and its subsidiary bodies, fully cover

(Mr. Komatina, Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations)

the concern expressed by the Chairman of the Committee on Conferences. By the arrangement of the weekly timetable, we have been able to inform the Conference Services Division of cancellations of meetings in advance, so that the resources available could be reassigned to other meetings. We will report accordingly through you, Mr. President, to the Chairman of the Committee on Conferences.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations for his statement.

As is the practice in the Conference, the secretariat has circulated today the timetable for meetings to be held by the Conference and its subsidiary bodies during the coming week. The timetable is as usual only indicative and subject to change if the need arises. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Conference adopts the timetable.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: As agreed by the Conference in the timetable of meetings for the current week, we shall hold, immediately after this plenary meeting, an informal meeting devoted to the substance of agenda item 3. I recognize the distinguished Ambassador of the Soviet Union.

Mr. BATSANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The Soviet delegation plans to make a statement here soon, and I think we shall then have an opportunity to welcome you to your responsible post, Sir. I have taken the floor for a brief piece of information. Some time ago in the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons it was announced that on Thursday, after the plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament, the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, that is yours truly, proposes to and is ready to meet with States not members of the Conference which are taking part in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee. This meeting is to be held in room I, right next door.

The PRESIDENT: I thank Ambassador Batsanov for his statement. Does any other delegation wish to take the floor?

I shall now adjourn the meeting. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Thursday, 7 March, at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 11.20 a.m.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CV/PV.586
7 March 1991

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FIVE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SIXTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 7 March 1991, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Carl-Magnus Hyltenius (Sweden)

GE.91-60456/3032B

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 586th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

At the outset, I wish to extend a warm welcome to the United Nations Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Yasushi Akashi, who is joining us today at this plenary meeting. The Under-Secretary-General is responsible for the substantive servicing of our Conference, and I wish to thank him for the interest he shows in our work, as well as for his outstanding support for the activities of the Conference.

I should like to note that tomorrow, 8 March, is International Women's Day, a date universally celebrated in recognition of the role of women in all fields of human endeavour. I take pleasure today in welcoming the participants in the women's conference dealing with the relationship between arms and the environment and I should like to extend to them, as well as to the women participating directly in the work of our own Conference, our warm congratulations on the occasion of their day, with which we fully associate ourselves. Every year, the Conference on Disarmament has joined in recognizing the importance of the role of women and has received the views of their organizations gathered together to discuss important world problems. The women's conference has addressed a message to us, which I shall request the Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to read out for the information of delegations. I invite Ambassador Komatina to take the floor.

Mr. KOMATINA (Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations): The statement addressed to the members of the Conference on Disarmament by the participants in the women's conference on the relationship between arms and the environment reads as follows:

"One year ago, we, the participants of the 8 March Women's Gathering, addressed you the members of the Conference on Disarmament, regarding the issues on the agenda before you in view of the dramatic changes in Europe, and our concerns for the health and environmental consequences of nuclear radiation from weapons production and testing. We were very pleased to note that during subsequent months, several of the Conference's members and non-members addressed these issues in their statements to this body, and to the partial test-ban Treaty Amendment Conference held in New York during January of this year.

"The Gulf war has underscored the importance for progress on the critical issues before this Conference. We wish to refer specifically to the need for the speedy conclusion of the convention prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and for their destruction, to the need for further progress in nuclear disarmament, and for the conclusion of a binding international instrument prohibiting attacks on nuclear facilities as potential radiological weapons.

(Mr. Komatina Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations)

"Recent events have also highlighted the importance of strengthening the non-proliferation Treaty. Towards this end, we view the realization of the goals expressed in the preamble and article VI of that Treaty - specifically the cessation of nuclear testing and nuclear disarmament - as fundamental to the preservation and strengthening of the Treaty beyond 1995. While we welcome the early re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban, we urge the Conference to go beyond deliberations and to give this Committee a mandate to negotiate a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

"The Gulf war has demonstrated the enormous damage that weapons and war inflict upon the environment. Our meeting has conducted a case-study of the environmental impact of the war. While full information on the environmental consequences is not yet available and may take months or years to assess, many experts are predicting that the oil-well fires may take one to five years to extinguish, and that severe environmental problems will occur, undermining the basis for life in the region and beyond.

"With our world facing a serious ecological crisis, we are concerned that inadequate attention is paid to the real and potential environmental costs of all types of weaponry. Consequently, in our consultation this year we are examining the relationship between arms and the environment - from the mining of the world's resources for military purposes, through weapons production and testing, to military bases, maneouvres, to war. We welcome the plans to hold a United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in 1992, and we are urging United Nations Member States to include military issues on the agenda for this important meeting.

"We are deeply concerned for the future - for our children and for our planet. The goal of general and complete disarmament, endorsed by the United Nations first special session on disarmament in 1978, is not a utopian dream. It is a global imperative to build just relations and to release the resources necessary to respond to the ecological and developmental crises that threaten to steal the future.

"It is your responsibility to negotiate the disarmament agreements that will help to usher in a safe and secure future, free from the menace of weapons of mass destruction. Global relations must be based not on military force but on co-operation."

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Secretary-General of the Conference for reading out the statement addressed to us by the women's conference, and I should also like to wish the participants in the conference every success in their deliberations.

Before I proceed to our list of speakers for today, I wish to ask whether any delegation wishes to take the floor at this stage, in view of the statement we have just heard. I recognize the distinguished representative of France.

Mr. BESANÇENOT (France) (translated from French): I would like to make a brief statement on behalf of the group of Western countries, to welcome here today the participants in the meeting organized on the occasion of International Women's Day. We are aware of the important role played by women in non-governmental organizations working for peace and disarmament. We listened with great interest to the message they addressed to the Conference. The topic chosen this year - arms and the environment - is a particularly appropriate subject at a time when the Gulf conflict is coming to an end. The concern expressed with respect to the ecological disaster caused by pollution of the Gulf and the burning of Kuwaiti oil wells by Iraq is of course shared by our countries: such actions are utterly reprehensible.

The Gulf conflict thus demonstrated that, while arms can of course cause serious damage to the environment, nevertheless it is first and foremost the criminal conduct of certain leaders who flout international law that gives rise to the most serious impacts on our natural environment. The end of hostilities in the Gulf and the success of the actions taken by the international community united to enforce the elementary rules of law should therefore be welcomed as good news for the preservation of human lives, but also as good news for environmental protection. Indeed, measures are already being implemented to try to remedy the worst consequences of pollution in the region.

The year 1990 was a year of hope for all who aspire to a more peaceful world where human rights are respected. After the revolutionary changes we witnessed in 1989, especially in Europe, last year saw the finalization of an extremely important conventional disarmament agreement - the CFE Treaty - as well as the substantial strengthening of confidence-building and security-building measures in Europe. These agreements were made possible by positive changes in the situation in central and eastern Europe, and made it possible to lay the foundations for a new, more equitable order in the old continent. The CSCE summit formalized this new state of affairs in the Charter of Paris for a New Europe. Therefore we can only welcome this progress, and hope that the positive trends that have emerged in this way will be consolidated and built upon in the future. The example of such co-operation between yesterday's adversaries should be to the benefit of other regions of the world. And here we are thinking in particular of the Gulf region and the Middle East in general.

In other areas of arms control too, 1990 saw progress which we hope will rapidly lead to agreements: as regards START, concerning the nuclear weapons of the two major Powers; and as regards the chemical weapons negotiations, which are taking up the bulk of the efforts of the Conference on Disarmament.

The Gulf crisis, which involved a serious threat that chemical weapons would be used, showed us, if we needed to be shown, that there was an urgent need to achieve a universal ban on such arms. The Conference on Disarmament must therefore redouble its efforts to devise imaginative wording whereby the final very complex problems involved in such an agreement can be resolved. We are confident that with good will on all sides, it will be possible to finalize this convention in the near future, so as to strengthen security for all.

(Mr. Besancenot, France)

Outside the chemical field, the Conference must also continue to devote due attention to the important questions relating to nuclear weapons and the prevention of an arms race in outer space, which are on its agenda. The group of Western countries, for its part, is determined to continue to make an active contribution to the negotiations and discussions under way in the Conference.

I would like to conclude by stressing how the presence of our guests today is an encouragement to us in our efforts. This earns them our warm gratitude.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of France for his statement. Does any other delegation wish to take the floor? I recognize the Ambassador of Argentina.

Mr. GARCIA MORITAN (Argentina) (translated from Spanish): On behalf of the Group of 21 I should like to express our satisfaction at the presence in this plenary meeting of the participants in the women's conference. That conference highlights the importance of the role of women in priority areas that are germane to the very survival of the human being and the environment. In an ever more interdependent world, it appears increasingly difficult to separate security issues from those pertaining to the future of the individual and the planet. We are certain that the Conference being held on armaments and the environment will be a contribution that will make it possible to broaden world awareness of the importance of tackling these issues vigorously and urgently. We hope, as we did last year, to receive a report on its conclusions for careful analysis. In reiterating the gratitude of the Group of 21 to the women's conference, I would like on behalf of the Group to wish it every success in its discussions.

Mr. HOU (China) (translated from Chinese): International Women's Day is an important international festival. On this day 500 million Chinese women commemorate the event with women in the rest of the world. We are most pleased that on the eve of the festival the representatives of some international women's organizations are among us in this plenary. The Chinese delegation extends its welcome and warm greetings to them. We would also like to express our congratulations to all other women present here.

Arms control and disarmament is an important issue that has a bearing on the peace, security and happiness of the people of the world. This year, in line with the resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly at its most recent session, we have started the Third Disarmament Decade. The tasks before us will be even more arduous, and the joint efforts of the international community, including the community of women, will be much needed.

Many international organizations and non-governmental organizations, including women's organizations, have already made great contributions in this regard, and will play an even greater role. We would like to express our appreciation for their efforts and contributions.

Mr. GASPAR (Czechoslovakia): On behalf of the Group of East European and other States, I would like to join the previous speakers and also warmly welcome the representatives of the women's conference, as well as women in the

(Mr. Gaspar, Czechoslovakia)

delegations attending today's plenary meeting on Women's Day. It is a common feeling that the address that we listened to, as well as the forthcoming Conference, is very important and is an example of the activities of women's organizations towards strengthening peace and security in the world. It is an honour for my delegation to express our sincere congratulations on the eve of International Women's Day to mothers, wives, sisters, daughters, all women who make our lives more convenient, fine and beautiful. I wish the women present good health, a happy family life, success in their work, simply all the best.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Czechoslovakia for his statement. Does any other delegation wish to take the floor at this stage? It seems not. Let us then proceed to our list of speakers for today. I have on my list of speakers for today the representatives of Yugoslavia, Hungary, Australia and Peru. I now give the floor to the representative of Yugoslavia, Ambassador Calovski.

Mr. CALOVSKI (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, it is my particular pleasure to greet you, the representative of friendly Sweden, and to express my cordial congratulations on your resumption of this important and responsible function. I take the opportunity also to extend my cordial greetings to His Excellency Ambassador Rasaputram of Sri Lanka, who presided with great success over the first organizational phase of the work of our Conference. I extend my cordial greetings also to the Secretary-General of the Conference, Ambassador Komatina, who is successfully executing his function of Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations at the Conference on Disarmament. I would also like to welcome in our midst Under-Secretary-General Akashi, and I would also like to join the previous speakers who have eloquently spoken on the important role of the women's movement generally and particularly in the field of disarmament.

This session of the Conference opened under the shadow of the war in the Gulf, which has fortunately ended. Its cause lay in the amassing of arms which encouraged the belief that political and other aims - right through to aggression and annexation of a small non-aligned country - could be achieved through the use of force. The result, of course, was disastrous and proved once again that there is no rationality in the tendency to achieve political aims by military means. It is also unrealistic to expect that in the world of today peace and security can be preserved without a fundamental dialogue and without the reaching of permament solutions on a comprehensive basis for problems peoples and States are faced with.

It is well known that Yugoslavia was intensively engaged in efforts aimed at preventing the Gulf war on the basis of the principles of the Security Council resolutions. Once the war had broken out Yugoslavia engaged in efforts for its cessation and for the reinstatement of peace. Our activities were carried out within the framework of the Non-Aligned Movement and the United Nations, in co-operation with the countries of the region and in continuous contact with directly involved or interested parties.

Yugoslavia welcomed with great relief the cessation of the war in the Gulf, the liberation of Kuwait and the reinstatement of its sovereignty and legitimate Government. This historic moment for the people of Kuwait is at the same time the victory of the aspirations of all the peoples and States in the world to freedom and peace.

(Mr. Calovski, Yugoslavia)

In this era when new and more just relations in the world are being created, the international community confirmed through its decisive action the unacceptability of a policy of aggression and the fait accompli, thus strengthening the possibilities and prospects for constructing a stable peace and security in the interest of all.

The Gulf countries and the entire international community, as well as the Non-Aligned Movement, are now facing a great responsibility and obligation to remove all the grave consequences of war, to strengthen peace and security and to establish permanent stability in this region. This would create the indispensable conditions for initiating the process of finding a speedy solution to the Middle East crisis as a whole.

It is evident that the process of ending the cold war is a rather complex process. It is not enough to merely have a transformation from the top; it is also necessary to make a radical turn in the actual basis - in the concepts and understanding of what kind of balance in international relations we are really in need of. The thesis that the balance of power, and hence of fear, is the only sound basis for relations, obviously can no longer meet the reality of the contemporary world. A need for a balance of interests which would become the basis for new common values and motives is emerging.

There is no doubt that the recent positive developments have been strongly influenced by the successful bilateral negotiations between the United States and the USSR. The orientation toward dialogue and co-operation certainly nourishes the hope that bilateral undertakings - particularly in the field of disarmament - can be shifted into the multilateral field.

What is now emerging to the surface are precisely those important components of international security and co-operation which the policy of non-alignment has been striving for from its very beginning to the present day. What we can see is that non-alignment was never only an attitude towards the blocs but that it was and still is a policy and phenomenon with a much broader basis, a reaction to international relations that should be changed but also a platform offering changes. There is neither a unipolar nor a bipolar world. This awareness should stimulate all in taking up constructive and realistic stands in a joint effort to make the world a more peaceful and more secure place. In order to be closer to stability and prosperity based on coexistence, disarmament and a new integration on a democratic basis, it is necessary to take into consideration all the factors and relations in the world.

Disarmament is an integral part of all contemporary processes, and there is no doubt that positive changes in political relations accelerate the advances in this field too. Out of the collapse of a system based on the doctrine of military balance we are now closer than ever before to the creation of new foundations which should be based on a sound system of undiminished security for all. The time has come for a new concept of international security which should become a permanent value for international peace and stability, especially since the technological breakthroughs in the military field do not bring with them more security.

(Mr. Calovski, Yugoslavia)

This Conference is a representative negotiating body and it must efficiently and decisively approach the issue of accomplishing the tasks and aims set before it. The disarmament problems on the international agenda today are present more than ever before in the history of international relations - both a political and a negotiating process. A global approach should be adopted in all the disarmament fields - nuclear, chemical and conventional - and the positive results of negotiations achieved so far, particularly the results of bilateral negotiations between the United States and the USSR and those within the context of the CSCE, should stimulate the efforts of this Conference.

It is indisputable that the freeing of the world from the terror of arms of mass destruction is a priority task of this Conference. It is normal and justifiable that the complex of nuclear disarmament should be a priority agenda item of the Conference. There is no doubt that, for example, the halting of all nuclear tests is one of the most urgent goals to be reached within this Conference.

We support the bilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament, but they cannot replace multilateral negotiations and agreements. A broad consensus has been reached on the need to have the negotiations on the prohibition of nuclear tests intensified at this very Conference, and we believe that in this respect there should be no hesitation, the more so since present scientific and technological knowledge and instruments make possible a high level of safety in matters of control and verification. Yugoslavia is of the opinion that a moratorium on nuclear tests by all nuclear Powers would facilitate the signing of a comprehensive agreement on their prohibition. The results of the Amendment Conference held in New York are well known, and we support the agreement that further efforts should be made within the Conference on Disarmament.

As regards the other priority of this Conference - chemical weapons - Yugoslavia's interest and, we can say, that of the entire Non-Aligned Movement, is to have a decisive step forward taken towards the adoption of a global and comprehensive convention. We are aware that a number of primarily political problems should be solved as soon as possible, since any fundamental advance in the negotiations on the convention depends on them. We would like to have these issues examined and decided upon at a special session of this Conference at ministerial level whenever it is considered that such a session could contribute to the adoption of the convention. We trust we all agree that a universal approach to the convention should be achieved - if possible before the entry into force of the convention. This is the main aim of the proposal Yugoslavia submitted at the last special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to disarmament, namely that immediately after agreement is reached on the convention a special conference should be convened under the auspices of the United Nations to enable all the member States of the United Nations to adopt and sign the convention.

It is very important that the convention should be an important and attractive enough instrument offering more security to all the signatories. I believe I share the opinion of all of you when I say that, when the convention enters into force, a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons, including the prohibition of use, should also enter into force. I hope it

(Mr. Calovski, Yugoslavia)

will not be an exaggeration if I say that in a political sense the prohibition of the use of chemical weapons was adopted two years ago in the Paris Declaration, which is one more reason why the prohibition in the convention should be formulated in such a manner as to eliminate chemical weapons once and for all, and why they should never, under any condition, be legalized again.

As regards the prevention of the arms race in outer space, this issue has emerged as most topical because of scientific and technological developments and the reasonable demand of the international community that space should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. We should not allow the arms race to spread into outer space as it is in the interest of all to have scientific and technological achievements in this endless space mostly used for solving basic living and developmental needs of man, especially in the developing countries. So far during the work of the Conference numerous proposals and initiatives have been submitted on expanding the legal system, on strengthening security, on greater transparency of space activities and on confidence-building measures. All of this we see as a valuable contribution to preventing the arms race in outer space. Since a growing number of countries are acquiring the technological capability for space activities, the multilateral character of these issues is becoming ever more significant.

In the context of overall development, there is a growing need for a complex approach to the problem of limiting the use of scientific and technological achievements for military purposes, as the requests and needs for orienting them towards peaceful purposes are being increasingly stressed and becoming increasingly justified. An unhindered approach to having these achievements used for peaceful purposes is of fundamental importance for economic development, and this was rightfully stressed in Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar's message to the Conference at the inauguration of this session.

For several years now this forum has been dealing with multilateral as well as bilateral efforts for ending the arms race and for disarmament. Yugoslavia has no dilemma: in the disarmament process every effort is welcome, regardless of whether it is unilateral, bilateral, regional or a universal undertaking contributing to the accomplishment of a goal we are all aiming at - a world without nuclear or other arms of mass destruction, a world with minimal stocks of conventional arms of a purely defensive character, a world of maximum security with a minimum of armaments. Until this aim is reached, Yugoslavia will support efforts in the field of disarmament, on whatever level, or in whatever part of the world.

We are convinced that the potentials emerging from the present relations in the world, as well as from the changes in the societies in many countries, are much greater than is reflected in the negotiations. In order to move faster we should not wait for the concessions of others but we should all together, with more courage, enter into relations of interaction and negotiations. It is obvious that at the end of the cold war the need for fundamental and responsible talks and decisions on disarmament measures has been intensified - less and less within a narrow circle of States, but rather as a collective effort in the construction of a new balance of interests, values and motives, in which this Conference has a role and significance that cannot be avoided.

(Mr. Calovski, Yugoslavia)

Before I conclude I would like to take this opportunity to inform you of the following with regard to the statement delivered at this Conference two weeks ago by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Hungary, Mr. Géza Jeszenszky, on the issue of the illegal arms deal between Hungary and Yugoslavia, since a number of representatives in this Conference have expressed the wish to be adequately informed.

The illegal export of arms from Hungary to Yugoslavia was the subject of intensive communications between the two Governments. The Yugoslav Government asked for a thorough investigation with the aim of establishing the real state of affairs. The first reaction of the Hungarian side was to deny any connection with the illegal arms deal. The Yugoslav side could not accept that position, since it had proof to the contrary, and qualified the arms deal as an infraction of Yugoslav sovereignty, an interference in its internal affairs and an action contrary to international law and the principles and the provisions of the United Nations Charter and the CSCE.

Later the Hungarian Government, at the beginning of February 1991, issued two statements acknowledging the arms deal but minimizing its scope and significance. In response to this, the Yugoslav side repeated the expectation that an investigation would be carried out and that the Hungarian Government would establish the real facts and provide adequate information, offering explanations and accepting responsibility.

At Hungary's initiative, State Secretary Katona then paid a visit to Belgrade. He presented an official note in which, among other things, the Hungarian side expressed its regret at not having provided the Yugoslav side with detailed information, and at the public statements made before the actual investigation was carried out. In these talks it was established on the basis of the official Hungarian presentation that the illegal arms deal was not a routine trade transaction on the part of a Hungarian export company, nor could trade liberalization have been an excuse for what was, as a matter of fact, a very large illegal export of arms to Yugoslavia. It was also established that the deal violated the agreement between the two countries on mutual arms deals, military equipment deals and the sale of technology which explicitly states that such business may be carried out only between the two Governments, or by organizations and institutions so authorized by the two Governments.

It is now clear that the arms were sold with the approval of the Hungarian Government, and that the Yugoslav Government was deliberately kept in the dark. In the opinion of the Yugoslav Government this matter cannot be treated as an administrative mistake but as a political problem which touches upon the sovereign interests of Yugoslavia.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Yugoslavia for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the next speaker on my list, the representative of Hungary, Ambassador Tóth.

Mr. TOTH (Hungary): Mr. President, this is not the first time my delegation has taken the floor under your presidency, since the Foreign Minister of Hungary had the opportunity to address the Conference on Disarmament recently. Still, I would like to express my personal satisfaction

(Mr. Tóth, Hungary)

at seeing you preside over our Conference. I am sure that your able guidance will lead us to progress in resolving the problems ahead of us. I would like as well to welcome most cordially Mr. Yasushi Akashi, Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament, whose presence in the Conference on Disarmament is always a moral support for us in our endeavours to meet the multifaceted challenges in the field of disarmament. At the same time I would like to convey our heartfelt welcome and congratulations to the members of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the participants in the annual women's gathering present in the meeting room, and also our lady colleagues on the eve of International Women's Day.

The most recent meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Organization took place on 25 February 1991 in Budapest. As a part of the traditional task of the host country I have the honour to present to the Conference on Disarmament the "Statement of the member States of the Warsaw Treaty" contained in document CD/1071. We are convinced that this is a statement of historic importance. It reflects the decision that, bearing in mind the fundamental changes in Europe, the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty, acting as sovereign and equal States, have decided to dismantle the military organs and structures of the Treaty by 31 March 1991. Speaking on behalf of the Republic of Hungary, let me share with you the views of my Government on the occasion of this event.

It will probably be a formidable task for a generation of historians to reveal the place and role of the Warsaw Treaty in the last 35 years. It might be extremely difficult at this stage to arrive at common evaluations. At the same time, we have an urgent task to face today's challenges and even the questions of tomorrow. Therefore, the major direction in which we must concentrate our efforts is to create a new form and structure of relations that comply with democratic requirements and respect sovereignty in the field of disarmament as well.

After more than half a century, a Europe whole and free can determine its own future. Artificial and forced relations will be replaced by natural and healthy co-operation. The pulling down of political barriers will give way to a wider interpretation of European integrity. Obviously, the bipolar strategic concept that has characterized our continent for decades is also fading away, and a new situation is emerging where each and every country has to reassess its security requirements. Hungary is not an exception to that either.

We strongly believe that long-lasting peace and stability cannot be built any more on the foundation of opposing military alliances. The direction of the European processes is pointing towards a co-operative security system based on common interests and shared democratic values. We envisage this system as the complex of all the organizations and treaties, and full respect for international legal and political obligations. The formal decision on the dismantling of the military organization of the Warsaw Treaty is only the beginning of a long road. The next stage is to be reached in 1992 at the Helsinki follow-up meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

(Mr. Tóth, Hungary)

It was this conviction that guided our activities at the CFE negotiations in Vienna. We consider that this Treaty puts an end to the era of confrontation and division and, together with the Charter of Paris for a New Europe, provides the conditions for a new approach to security in Europe.

The loosening of former ties must certainly not push Eastern Europe into becoming a potential source of instability. Naturally, the difficulties involved in establishing a market economy, the emergence of moral and political problems while transforming our societies into a truly democratic system, and also the historically inherited problem of national minorities might sometimes strain relations between these countries. Regional co-operation based on geographical proximity, equality and mutual interests has a significant role to play here. The Pentagonal Initiative or co-operation between Poland, the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic and Hungary might serve as examples providing a framework for joint action in the most various fields.

In this spirit we are conducting bilateral negotiations with the other States parties to the Warsaw Treaty to review the agreements that constituted the basis of our relations and replace them with new instruments reflecting present European requirements. We also seek an equal partnership in the context of military security, but we strictly observe the right of every State to choose its own security arrangements.

I believe it is obvious from the statement of the Political Consultative Committee that this decision will have far-reaching effects in the relations between Hungary and its neighbours, in European co-operation and in a wider context as well. To analyse these effects and reassess the previous axioms is not a task to be accomplished in a fortnight. In our opinion, the decision to dismantle the military organization of the Warsaw Treaty will also entail consequences for the work of the Conference on Disarmament. It might affect the interpretation of certain issues on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament, and I have no doubt that it will also stimulate some fresh thinking on whether the imaginary barrier between the different groups of countries in the Conference really has to be more solid than the Berlin Wall itself used to be.

In concluding my statement, and with reference to the recent statement of the distinguished Ambassador of Yugoslavia, I can only reiterate the readiness of my Government, expressed in the statement of the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Hungary two weeks ago in the Conference on Disarmament, to co-operate in the bilateral, regional or wider global context with States wishing to solve problems related to the international arms trade.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Hungary for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to me. I now give the floor to the representative of Australia, Ambassador O'Sullivan.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia): Mr. President, as this is the first occasion I have had to speak during your stewardship of our Conference, may I say how much we appreciate your efforts and the consistently practical and effective contribution of your delegation? Like my colleagues I would also say how pleased I am to acknowledge Mr. Akashi's presence with us today.

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australia)

We are pleased to welcome back in the Public Gallery today the women who have gathered here, as they do each year, to mark International Women's Day and to devote four days to discussion and reflection on current issues related to our common endeavours for the promotion of international peace and security.

We pay particular homage to the organisers of this annual event, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. Founded in April 1915, by women from belligerent and non-belligerent countries alike, in protest at the carnage of the First World War, the League is one of the oldest non-governmental organizations, still working actively for the promotion of peace today.

The conflict in the Gulf has thrown into stark relief the catastrophic consequences of armed conflict for peoples and the world in which they live. This war has brought with it shattering consequences for the environment which will take years, if not decades to repair.

The theme they will be addressing here in Geneva in 1991 thus takes on particular significance. Arms control and the environment represent two of the most critical issues of current concern to the international community and to its individual members. Developments in the field of arms and environment can also have a direct bearing on the third leg of the triad of issues of international significance today, that of development. Accordingly, their discussions will be of great interest to a wide audience.

The Gulf crisis reminds us again of the relative suddenness with which States find themselves propelled into resolving aggression and disputes by military means, while at the same time, and some may say paradoxically, working through bodies like the Conference on Disarmament to put into practice our commonly shared conviction that a stable world with fewer weapons will be a more secure and peaceful place.

A world governed by an increasing body of global rules for the progressive reduction or abolition of armaments will make a fundamental contribution to the promotion and maintenance of peace and stability. However, to be effectively implemented and respected, such rules must be based on principles of equal rights and obligations.

Women carry with them a long and often painful history of struggle for the attainment of equal rights and opportunities. In doing so, they have not shirked their responsibilities in taking on equal obligations.

An issue of particular concern to the Australian Government and on which we have made a number of statements in the United Nations, also together with New Zealand and Canada, is the improvement of the status of women in the United Nations Secretariat.

Women's equality is a matter of basic human rights and social justice, as stated in Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations. Therefore one would expect the United Nations and organizations with close links to the United Nations to be in the vanguard of making these equal rights a reality. Unfortunately the structure of its Secretariat does not reflect such a role.

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australia)

The joint Canada, Australia and New Zealand statement to the United Nations in New York in October 1990 stated:

> "The equal participation of women in the Secretariat is vital to the efficient running of this Organization. The Charter stipulates the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity. This cannot be attained if the talents of important staff members are frustrated rather than developed. With women contributing only about 30 per cent of the Professional staff, and substantially less at higher levels, there can be no question that their talents are being under-utilized. If women are not included among the decision makers both the needs of women and their potential to contribute tend to be systematically neglected or ignored. For the sake of the effectiveness of the various United Nations programmes, women must be in the mainstream of the head office."

The most recent overall United Nations figures (in document A/45/541) bear out that women are still underrepresented in the total number of Professional staff. They now constitute almost 30 per cent of the Professional staff. Over the past 10 years there has been a rise of less than 1 per cent in the level of Professional women's representation. This is not a record to be proud of, keeping also in mind that progress has been mainly at the lower and middle levels. It will be a test of the United Nations bona fides to see whether these women will progress into the higher echelons over the next few years.

It is at the Director and above level that the Organization is most visible and where many of the important decisions are made. It is of great concern that women are not better represented here, including in the department of disarmament affairs. At the P-5 and at the P-4 level on the other hand, women are rather well represented in the DDA. We trust this bodes well for the future. In this context the General Assembly has urged the Secretary-General to accord priority to increasing to 25 per cent the participation rate of women in posts at the D-1 level and above within the overall participation rate of women in the 35 per cent of posts subject to geographical distribution by 1995.

In Geneva we note that of the six Professional positions only one of them is held by a woman. This falls well short of the 30 per cent target the United Nations had set itself for 1990 in resolution 44/185 C, let alone the 35 per cent target the General Assembly has set for 1995 in its resolution 45/125 and does not reflect the overall level of female representation in the department of disarmament affairs.

The figures speak for themselves. Let me conclude my brief commentary by noting that the problems faced by women in the United Nations Secretariat are not unique. They are mirrored in civil services and other international organizations throughout the world. We are also aware that one of the inhibiting factors for a more equal male/female balance in Secretariat positions is the unwillingness of many United Nations Member States to field women as candidates in posts subject to geographical distribution. The responsibility for redressing the unequal situation of women in the United Nations and associated bodies therefore rests on all our shoulders. Australia is determined to continue to play its part in promoting this obligation which we collectively share as Member States and as officials.

(Mr. Calderón, Peru)

My delegation has taken note with great interest of the report submitted by the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events, contained in document CD/1065. Peru supports this eminently technical effort designed to put the finishing touches to a fundamental aspect of the future machinery for verification of the comprehensive nuclear test ban. And this is why it stresses the importance of avoiding the politicization of this Group, in order not to distort the important test under way. What the Conference would be well advised to do is consider to what extent and in what way the mandate of the Group of Scientific Experts can be improved upon so that its efforts properly fit in with the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on agenda item 1. Without complicating things, our efforts should be directed towards ensuring that the Group of Scientific Experts tackles other technical aspects also relating to verification.

Before concluding, I should like to place on record my country's gratitude to the Government of Austria for the valuable technical support that is making it possible for Peruvian experts to participate in the second technical test (GSETT-2). Due to the vagaries of geography, Peru has experience in this matter, aside from Lima's being the headquarters of the regional seismology centre (CERESIS). Hence the Austrian co-operation is highly opportune and much appreciated.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Peru for his statement and for the kind words addressed to the Chair. That concludes my list of speakers for today. Does any other member wish to take the floor? I recognize the distinguished representative of Pakistan.

Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan): As I am addressing the Conference for the first time under your stewardship, Sir, may I say how happy we are to see you in the Chair and how confident that the work of the Conference will proceed positively and constructively under your customary distinction and excellence?

During the course of an earlier meeting, I was asked to undertake bilateral consultations on the subject of the improved and effective functioning of the Conference on Disarmament. I am happy to report that, during the course of these bilateral consultations, I have found general willingness and agreement that the process of informal open-ended consultations on the improved and effective functioning of the Conference on Disarmament should start towards the end of our current session. A number of heads of delegation have also identified specific subjects that they would like to see discussed during these informal open-ended consultations. It is my own feeling that these ideas should be aired in the informal open-ended consultations themselves, so that the exercise remains fully transparent and so that all members have a chance to comment on them. The secretariat has indicated to me that a convenient slot for the first meeting of these informal open-ended consultations would be available at 10 a.m. on Tuesday, 19 March 1991. I trust this will be agreeable to all our colleagues. Given the importance of the exercise, as well as the need for free, frank and transparent discussions, it is my hope that these informal open-ended consultations will draw the same personal interest on the part of heads of delegation as they did last year.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Pakistan, Ambassador Kamal, for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to me. In view of the statement just made, may I ask the Conference whether there is any objection to having the informal open-ended consultations on the question of the improved and effective functioning of the Conference before the end of this session? I see none. Ambassador Kamal also indicated that a convenient time would be 10 a.m. on Tuesday 19 March, and that also seems to meet with the agreement of member States.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I should now like to turn to another subject. You will recall that, at our last plenary meeting, I indicated my intention to put before the Conference for adoption the recommendation contained in paragraph 15 of the report of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events (CD/1065), concerning the dates of its next session. In that connection, I wish to report to you that further consultations are needed before we take up this question again. I shall keep you informed of the results of those consultations.

You will also recall that, at our last plenary meeting, I circulated the draft of a letter that I would address, as President of the Conference, to the Director-General of the International Maritime Satellite Organization, inviting that organization to send a representative to the next session of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts. I noted at that time that, if no objections were received before this plenary meeting, the letter would then be sent. No objections have been received by the secretariat and, accordingly, I shall proceed with the dispatch of the communication as suggested, the only change being the deletion of the reference to the dates indicated for the next session of the Ad Hoc Group, which as I just said are to be the subject of further consultations.

The secretariat has circulated, at my request, the timetable of meetings to be held next week by the Conference and its subsidiary bodies. As usual the timetable is merely indicative and can be changed if necessary. On that understanding I suggest that we adopt the informal paper. I call on the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. BATSANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I have a very brief comment on the tentative timetable of our meetings for next week. As Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, I wish to say that in the Committee, we have not yet finished assigning the time allocated to us among the groups and other machinery. So, with respect to the total amount of time allocated to the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, of course I have no objections, nor do I have any objections to any of the other entries in this timetable, but I wish to say that this afternoon we will be having a meeting of the expanded bureau of the Ad Hoc Committee, while tomorrow there will be a meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee itself, at which there may be some minor adjustments made.

The PRESIDENT: I thank Ambassador Batsanov for his statement. As I indicated, the timetable is merely indicative and can be changed, so I still believe that on that understanding, and in view of what was just said by the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, we can adopt the informal timetable. Is there any objection? I see none.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: As agreed in the timetable of meetings for this week, immediately after this plenary meeting the Conference will hold its second informal meeting devoted to the substance of agenda item 2. I have no other business for today, and I now intend to adjourn this plenary meeting. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Thursday, 14 March, at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.587
14 March 1991

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FIVE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SEVENTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva
on Thursday, 14 March 1991, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Carl-Magnus Hyltenius (Sweden)

GE.91-60542/9677A

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 587th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

I have on my list of speakers today the representatives of Austria and Canada. I now give the floor to the representative of Austria, Ambassador Ceska.

Mr. CESKA (Austria): Mr. President, may I congratulate you on presiding over the Conference on Disarmament for the last four weeks? It is a particular pleasure for me to see you, a most skilful mediator, presiding over this body of the Conference in the same efficient manner as you did when chairing the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons in the course of 1990.

Austria deeply welcomes the liberation of Kuwait and the re-establishment of its independence. Thus the grave violation of basic norms of international law caused by Iraqi aggression has been rectified. We owe this to the resolve of the international community, and in particular the Member States co-operating with Kuwait in liberating this country pursuant to Security Council resolution 678.

We attach great importance to humanitarian questions, among which the immediate return of detained Kuwaiti and third country nationals and the release of all prisoners of war under the auspices of the ICRC are paramount. By the same token, measures will urgently have to be undertaken to safeguard access of the Kuwaiti and Iraqi population to medical supplies and foodstuffs. We should be aware that urgent measures for further humanitarian relief will be required from the international community. The next step will be the rapid establishment of a formal cease-fire. During this second phase, serious consideration should also be given - in consultation with countries of the region - to a United Nations role in monitoring such a cease-fire. Austria has already declared her readiness to contribute to such a United Nations effort.

This is not only a crucial time for international politics, but also for the work of this Conference. In a world where military confrontation still seems to play a continuing and most regrettable role, reductions in military capabilities are of the highest priority. This holds especially true for regions where existing tensions have created a large potential for military conflicts. Therefore, the Conference on Disarmament is called upon to seek rapid and at the same time effective solutions for the items on its agenda. In particular, the early conclusion of work on a global convention banning all chemical weapons is of great importance. The knowledge of the existence of such arsenals and of their terrifying effectiveness was tragically refreshed during the Iraq-Iran war. Most recently, seven weeks of uncertainty about the imminent use of chemical weapons in the Gulf stressed most expressively the seriousness of the threat. Given this experience, an effective, comprehensive, non-discriminatory and universally adhered-to convention as a guarantee for avoiding such situations in the future is in our view a pressing need.

Let me now turn to the actual negotiations on a CW convention and to key issues not resolved thus far. In this context, the work programme which has been proposed for the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons seems to us a very

(Mr. Ceska, Austria)

constructive approach in as much as it deals with all related questions. It provides for detailed consideration under the three headings of security, verification and organization, and at the same time takes account of their close interrelationship. Therefore, in my remarks, I will follow this working agenda.

The future convention will only be considered successful if it is able to guarantee the security of all States parties. In this regard, the security perceptions of quite different international actors have to be taken into account. Regional security interests demand particular attention under the convention. This seems especially true when considering ways and means of ensuring signature and ratification by all States of a given region. Only if full participation at the regional level is ensured, can universal commitment to the convention be expected. Therefore, particular importance has to be attributed to early involvement by all States in the elaboration of the convention. In this context, it is encouraging to note that an increasing number of non-member States are participating in the work of the Conference on Disarmament. The presence of an even greater number of States would create still more confidence and ensure the necessary global attention.

An important aspect of security relates to the question of the total destruction of all chemical weapons. In our view, adequate steps have to be undertaken to guarantee the feasibility of destruction of all chemical weapons within the envisaged time frame. To this end, transfer of necessary technology as well as regional arrangements for co-operation might be envisaged. But such activities should take place under strict international surveillance. Furthermore, all States should start to redefine their military doctrines in a way that leaves no place for the use of chemical weapons.

As to security concerns, the question of assistance in cases of the use or the threat of the use of chemical weapons is relevant. Adequate provisions should, on the one hand, guarantee rapid assistance in cases where there is an immediate need and, on the other hand, also ensure some form of political guidance for such circumstances.

The second "basket" deals with matters related to verification, which can be considered as the cornerstone of the future convention. Actually, a comprehensive discussion is focusing on solutions elaborated so far and on necessary changes. In our view, the future verification régime has to guarantee the necessary confidence in the convention by adequate and strict surveillance of compliance with the convention by all States. At the same time, the régime should be practical and flexible enough to deal with future developments such as production changes or new scientific knowledge. In this regard, we welcome the current efforts to streamline the overall verification regime while keeping the most important principle intact, i.e. verification of any relevant site anywhere at any time.

As a concrete contribution to these efforts, Austria has submitted working paper CD/1062 (CD/CW/WP.334) dated 21 February 1991, containing three studies related to the verification of non-production of chemical weapons. One study deals with materials monitoring in chemical production facilities, comparing relevant solutions in the Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances with the actual approach of the

(Mr. Ceska, Austria)

"rolling text". The other two studies deal with the development of a computer program for accounts auditing during inspections of facilities, one giving the theoretical background, the other describing the details of a computer program elaborated for that purpose. My delegation would be interested in any comments, and stands ready to offer any further information.

Turning to the third area, entitled "organization", let me start by elaborating on the question of participation and decision-making within the Executive Council of the future control organization. In our view, adequate geographical distribution of membership should be ensured, while at the same time it might be envisaged that some countries may seek more frequent representation in this organ than others, taking into account their specific interests and responsibilities. The question needs to be considered of whether consensus requirements or veto rights have a place in such an organ.

In the light of the progress achieved in the current negotiations, which will hopefully make it possible to finalize the CW convention in the near future, let me reiterate the readiness of Austria to host the future organization.

The financing of the activities of the future organization will have to strike a balance between political aspects and the technical needs of the organization. In other words, contributions to a general budget encompassing the current costs of activities should be borne by all States parties; contributions to a specific budget for verification activities should be based upon special criteria while still ensuring some form of cost-sharing as an expression of a global commitment to verification.

Turning to the area of biological weapons, let me start by commenting on questions related to the Third Review Conference of the parties to the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention, which is scheduled to take place in Geneva in September this year. As you are aware, Austria presided over the Second Review Conference and therefore continues to take a particular interest in all related matters.

The conclusion of the BW Convention in 1972 represented a major success in disarmament efforts and was facilitated by the fact that those weapons were then regarded as being of only limited military significance, and that no verification provisions were included in the treaty. The Second Review Conference succeeded in reaching agreement on a meeting of experts to elaborate confidence-building measures which were then adopted in the United Nations General Assembly. Twenty years after the conclusion of the treaty, however, some additional thought should be given to questions relating to institutional and technical as well as political and legal matters.

In the first place, it seems appropriate to state that national implementation of the Convention on a global level has been hampered by uncertainties relating to the scope of the Convention, and its relationship with peaceful economic activities or non-co-ordinated competences under national legislation. It might therefore prove useful to elaborate some form of general guidelines, taking into account the experience of some States parties in implementing the Convention.

(Mr. Ceska, Austria)

As the 1987 agreed confidence-building measures have, at least in our view, not been implemented in a satisfactory manner - given the limited number of countries responding and the wide variety of information provided - it would seem useful to elaborate stricter provisions regarding their application in order to avoid any misunderstandings. At the same time, a widening of the scope of such exchanges of information could be envisaged.

In order to deal with the question of verification, a committee could be established which would then survey compliance on a permanent basis, as the present interval of five years between review conferences seems too long for effective evaluation in this regard. Likewise, the establishment of a secretariat unit for preparing and servicing meetings of States parties as well as dealing with all kinds of exchanges of information might seem useful. In this context, let me mention that Austria is financing a UNIDIR study on issues and proposals that can be expected to play a role in the forthcoming Third Review Conference. This study is expected to be finalized and circulated by the end of March this year.

For more than 20 years the international community has been striving towards the conclusion of a treaty banning all nuclear explosions in all environments. One outcome of these continuing efforts was the partial nuclear test-ban Treaty concluded in 1963. Although limited in its scope, as underground testing has not been prohibited and no verification measures adopted, it is still a major arms control agreement. In order to advance to a CTBT, six countries initiated the holding of the so-called PTBT Amendment Conference in order to achieve a CTBT by way of amending the PTBT. This Conference allowed a comprehensive discussion of all related questions. We regret, however, that no consensus agreement could be reached and that voting on final language proved necessary.

Now that this item is back on the Conference's agenda, let me state that we welcome the consensus reached to continue the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on a CTBT. In our understanding, this Committee may deal with questions regarding the scope of a CTBT as well as the general pattern of verification of such a treaty. Present efforts should concentrate on finalizing the technical part of the envisaged global seismological network. Furthermore, additional efforts seem necessary to guarantee its global application. To enhance participation by all regions in this endeavour, Austria has made technical co-operation arrangements with Peru in view of the fact that the Latin American continent needs to be more fully represented.

Before I conclude, a word on the negotiations on conventional forces in Europe and on confidence-building and security-building measures, which are currently taking place in Vienna. As you are aware, a treaty of far-reaching importance on conventional forces was signed by the heads of State and Government of the 22 participants on the occasion of the CSCE summit in Paris last November. We hope that the comprehensive and undisputed implementation of this important treaty will be assured in the near future. The negotiations on confidence-building and security-building measures also produced a significant document before the Paris summit, which my delegation had the honour to forward to the Conference on Disarmament as document CD/1070.

(Mr. Ceska, Austria)

The Paris summit marked the beginning of a new era in European co-operation. Important steps were taken towards a system of co-operative security. A framework for political consultation, institutional arrangements - in particular the Conflict Prevention Centre set up in Vienna - as well as further negotiations on security matters between all CSCE participating States should significantly contribute to stability and security on the European continent.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Austria for his statement and for the kind words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Canada, Mr. Robertson.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Canada): My intervention today will be very brief since its purpose is only to table some documents. May I first, however, offer you our congratulations for the very effective job you have done during this past month in conducting and advancing the work of the CD?

In our delegation we have been encouraged over the years by the favourable reactions of other delegations to the distribution of our compendium of statements and working papers on outer space. In the hope that this will continue to prove useful to the members of the Conference, and in particular to those participating in the Ad Hoc Committee on this item, the Arms Control and Disarmament Division of the Canadian Department of External Affairs has produced a further volume covering the 1990 session of the CD and of the Ad Hoc Committee. This has been assigned the number CD/1073 and will shortly be distributed to delegations. I hope that it may contribute in a positive way, to advancing our work on this important subject.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Canada for his statement and for the kind words addressed to me. That concludes my list of speakers for today. Does any other member wish to take the floor?

As is the practice in the Conference, the secretariat has circulated today the timetable of meetings to be held next week by the Conference and its subsidiary bodies. The timetable is, as usual, only indicative and subject to change, if necessary. If there is no objection I shall take it that the Conference adopts the timetable.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: As agreed by the Conference in the timetable of meetings for the current week, we shall hold an informal meeting devoted to the substance of agenda item 3 immediately after this plenary meeting.

As I have no other business for today, I should like now to make my concluding statement as President.

When taking up the presidency of the Conference nearly four weeks ago I was pleased to note that most of the procedural decisions required for setting the work in motion had already been taken. There was only one outstanding matter of that nature, namely the issue of an appropriate organizational arrangement for dealing with agenda item 8, entitled "Comprehensive programme

(The President)

of disarmament". Since then Ambassador Marín Bosch of Mexico has been appointed to deal with this question. He is now in the process of consulting on the matter.

You will recall that, at the last plenary meeting, Ambassador Kamal of Pakistan referred to the bilateral consultations that he undertook in order to determine whether there was common ground for addressing certain issues relating to the question of the improved and effective functioning of the Conference. As a result of the recommendation by Ambassador Kamal, the Conference has decided to hold an informal open-ended consultation to consider this matter on Tuesday, 19 March.

In accordance with the decision taken by the Conference, informal meetings have been held on agenda items 2 and 3, at which a number of delegations participated in an extensive exchange of views.

In my opening statement I announced my intention to actively pursue the question of expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament. On that occasion I also emphasized that this question has been pending for many years now and expressed the view that it was high time that a determined effort was made to find a solution. In my opinion it is not reasonable to keep countries which have demonstrated their interest and competence waiting year after year. I have made a determined effort to see as many heads of delegation as possible in the limited time available to me. It has not been possible to reach everyone, so I can only share with you my impressions and preliminary conclusions on the basis of an extensive but not yet complete round of informal private consultations.

I am pleased to report, however, that there is widespread sympathy for the view that a determined effort should now be made, and that a large number of members have indicated that they are willing to look at a formula that would make it possible to enlarge the membership from the present figure of 39 to 44. As you recall, the CD in 1983 agreed to an expansion by not more than four States. This would have taken us up to the figure of 44. In the new situation that has arisen since the number of members decreased to 39, it would thus be possible to add five new States without exceeding the maximum number that was envisaged as early as 1983, eight years ago. It appears from my consultations tha some delegations would have difficulties, at least at this stage, in envisaging a larger number. They have, together with others, also emphasized the importance of keeping the membership of the Conference limited in order to ensure that it remains an effective negotiating body. A few delegations have stated that they consider that the present number of 39 is adequate. While some delegations may wish for a larger expansion, no delegation has so far excluded expansion up to 44, provided that an appropriate formula can be agreed.

In order to explore whether agreement on an appropriate new formula could emerge, the question of the distribution of new members between regions has been tentatively discussed. Although I was encouraged by the comments and suggestions, it is too early to draw any precise conclusions. This matter requires further consultations. Several delegations have emphasized the fact

(The President)

that a decision to enlarge the membership requires consensus on all new members, an important factor that will have to be taken into account in the nomination process in due course.

It goes without saying that a concrete decision on this matter requires that all the present members of the Conference be consulted. As I have already mentioned, I have made an effort to see as many colleagues as possible, but it has not been possible in the limited time available to me to reach everyone. Consultations must therefore continue. The indications given by individual heads of delegation have so far been encouraging.

Before concluding this statement I should like to express my sincere thanks to the group co-ordinators and to all delegations for their co-operation during the Swedish presidency. I am also most grateful to Ambassador Komatina, the Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and to Ambassador Berasategui, the Deputy Secretary-General. Their advice and the skill with which they perform their responsible tasks have been of great value to me. I also wish to thank all other members of the secretariat for their support and their invaluable contribution to the good functioning of this important Conference. Last but not least I should like to convey my best wishes to my successor as President, Ambassador Serguei Batsanov of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. His professional experience and competence are well known to the Conference, and I am sure that he will guide its work in a very effective and productive manner.

That concludes my statement. I shall now adjourn this plenary meeting. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Thursday, 21 March, at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 10.45 a.m.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.588
21 March 1991

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FIVE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-EIGHTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 21 March 1991, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Serguei B. Batsanov (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)

GE.91-60571/3076B

The PRESIDENT (translated from Russian): I declare open the 588th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

At the outset I wish to extend a warm welcome on behalf of the Conference to the First Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bulgaria, His Excellency Mr. Ivan Garvalov, who is our first speaker today. The First Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs has been actively involved in multilateral diplomacy and has vast experience in matters relating to the United Nations, including multilateral disarmament. Before taking up his present high position he headed the Human Rights Department and the United Nations and Disarmament Department in the Bulgarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and therefore he has been dealing with matters within the competence of our Conference, with which he is fully familiar. He has also worked in India, Myanmar, Indonesia and Egypt and in the Bulgarian mission to the United Nations. I am personally extremely happy to welcome him as our two countries have maintained traditionally close and friendly relations. I am looking forward to his statement today, which I am sure we will all follow with particular interest.

I should also like to welcome warmly the new representative of France, Ambassador Gérard Errera, who is attending our plenary meeting today for the first time. Ambassador Errera is a distinguished career diplomat who has served in a number of positions of responsibility in the French Foreign Ministry as a member of the cabinet of the Foreign Minister, and also in the Atomic Energy Commission. He was a member of the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency. I wish him every success in the performance of his duties here at the Conference, and I pledge my readiness to continue with him the close cooperation which marked our relations with his predecessor. As Ambassador Errera replaces Ambassador Pierre Morel, who has been recalled for highly important duties with his Government in Paris, I should like to ask Ambassador Errera to convey to Ambassador Morel our best wishes in his new responsibilities. Ambassador Morel played an outstanding role in our Conference. He was its President in August 1987. In 1988, Ambassador Morel was appointed Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. Under his chairmanship the Committee on Chemical Weapons made considerable progress in the negotiations on a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons. I cannot omit to mention the important role played by Ambassador Morel in the preparations for the conduct of and, of course, the successful conclusion of the Paris Conference of States Parties to the 1925 Geneva Protocol and Other Interested States, the Final Declaration of which provided this Conference with much-needed political impetus. Ambassador Morel discharged all these heavy responsibilities with exceptional political ability and diplomatic competence, which, together with his well-known personal qualities, earned him so many friends here in the Conference.

Allow me now to make the opening statement which I would like to make as President.

It is a great honour for the delegation of the USSR to perform the duties of presiding over the Conference, the most important multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament, in March-May 1991, despite the fact that this honour is the natural result of rotation. I would like to assure all members of the

(The President)

Conference of my intention to approach the important functions of President with a full sense of responsibility, and I will make every effort to facilitate the reaching of agreement both on questions of substance relating to the work of the Conference and on a number of procedural aspects that are deservedly of interest to delegations.

It will hardly be a novel thought if I note that our Conference, like all international structures, is passing through an extremely interesting and important period. At times the rapidly developing world situation goes through very hazardous turns, as we witnessed quite recently. And yet the prevailing trend is still the shaping of a new model of security based on respect for the right of peoples to choose, to settle questions by peaceful means and to strengthen dialogue and mutual understanding. Under these circumstances the significance of arms limitation and disarmament is not diminished but enhanced. There is every ground, I believe, for extending this consideration to our Conference, which is the main organ for multilateral negotiations in this field. It is another matter to ensure that the negotiating process in the field of disarmament does not lag behind other political processes in the world, but rather goes hand in hand with them, thus paving the way towards new security structures in which the military component would occupy a smaller and smaller place.

I represent a country which experienced in a particularly painful way the burden of the arms race, and the difficulties, including the objective difficulties, of the disarmament process, as well as the difficult process of realizing that beyond a certain line even the most destructive weapons do not add to security, but can diminish it. The Soviet Union is now living through a complex, critical period in its history. The society has emerged from the state of former equilibrium, but it has not yet acquired a new basis for consolidation, although the need for such a basis and the lack of prospects for methods of settling our internal problems by force is being ever more clearly and extensively perceived. In that context, we are particularly in need of favourable external conditions and of further progress along the way to curbing the arms race, not only in the bilateral Soviet-American or European areas, but also on the global scale. Hence our permanent interest in the efficient functioning of the Conference on Disarmament.

In connection with the fact that the Soviet representative is performing the duties of President of the Conference from this week onwards, the Foreign Minister of the USSR, A.A. Bessmertnykh, has requested me to convey to the Conference on Disarmament and all the delegations taking part in its proceedings, as well as the Secretary-General of the Conference, his wishes for success in resolving the tasks of the utmost importance which are on the agenda of this forum. He also instructed me to underline the unchanging nature of the Soviet Union's consistent course towards lower levels of military confrontation, and towards real disarmament. As regards the Conference on Disarmament, Minister Bessmertnykh asked me to note that this involves first of all the earliest possible completion of negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons, ensuring a qualitative shift in considering the problems of the complete prohibition of nuclear tests and the prevention of an arms race in outer space, and a constructive search for mutually acceptable solutions on other agenda items of this unique multilateral negotiating forum.

(The President)

As I take up the post of President of the Conference I note with a feeling of profound satisfaction and - if I am honest - relief, that the work on practically all topics is on the right track, that five ad hoc committees have been established and are working, that the mechanism of informal plenary meetings and the mechanism of discussing ways of enhancing the effectiveness of the Conference are operating. This is very much to the credit of two of my predecessors, the distinguished Ambassador Rasaputram of Sri Lanka and the distinguished Ambassador Hyltenius of Sweden. I am extremely grateful to them for their achievements in guiding the work of the Conference, and my task, as I see it, is not to mar the sound legacy which I have received from them. In my work I would like to rely, as my predecessors did, on close coordination and cooperation with all delegations and with the Conference secretariat, to whom we all owe a great deal. Naturally, I am always at the service of delegates, and would urge them not to hesitate to turn to me with any questions they may have.

That concludes my introductory statement, and I would like to propose to you that we should now proceed to the business of today's plenary meeting. I have on my list of speakers today, as I have already indicated, the First Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bulgaria, as well as the representatives of Nigeria, Japan and Venezuela. I now give the floor to the First Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bulgaria, His Excellency Mr. Ivan Garvalov.

Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria): Thank you very much for the kind words which you addressed to me in introducing me to the distinguished representatives at the Conference. I extend to you, Mr. President, my sincere congratulations on your accession to this high office. I would like to assure you of the support and cooperation of the Bulgarian delegation. I also express my gratitude to your predecessors, Ambassador Rasaputram of Sri Lanka and Ambassador Hyltenius of Sweden, for the energy and skill with which they conducted the work of the Conference on Disarmament in the first months of this year's session. I would also like to congratulate the Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and Personal Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General, Ambassador Komatina, the Deputy Secretary-General, Ambassador Berasategui, and all the staff of the secretariat, whose participation in our common endeavour here is highly valued by my delegation.

The Conference on Disarmament is one of the few forums where major international changes that have a direct bearing on international security are felt almost immediately and tangibly. The international community has witnessed such recent changes. They are, I would say, of a fundamental nature. This enables us to speak about shaping a qualitatively new political environment. It is precisely in such a new environment that disarmament will evolve, including its global aspects which are examined by this body. In its turn, my country, Bulgaria, has also been involved in a process of profound radical democratization of its political structures and economic system. The pace of the reform cuts across political, economic, social and public institutions. Bulgaria has reviewed and is rearranging the principles and priorities of its foreign policy. In fact they are qualitatively new; they determine my country's orientation towards all-round integration with the existing and newly emerging European structures, including security structures. We are seriously and thoroughly reassessing our national approach

(Mr. Garvalov, Bulgaria)

to issues of domestic and international security, and the role of arms control and disarmament. We now approach things primarily through the prism of Bulgaria's national interests as they appear in today's new international set-up. And of course the concern to strengthen international security and stability remains important for us. Our foreign policy is now independent, predicated on pragmatism and realities.

The sudden changes in Europe and throughout the world certainly have a direct bearing upon the security of Bulgaria, small as it may be, for it is situated in a European subregion which is important from a geo-political point of view. Bulgaria will seek security guarantees - political, economic and military - along all political parameters where we may meet with understanding and mutual interest. Of particular importance in this respect is for us to cooperate with the permanent members of the Security Council, the European States, political, security and economic alliances and organizations such as NATO, the Western European Union, the European Council, the Council of Europe and others, and with our neighbours. Bulgaria wishes to preserve its relations with traditional political partners, bring them into line with the new circumstances and place them on a mutually beneficial basis.

Bulgaria is very conscious of the importance of maintaining good-neighbourly security relations in the Balkans. We have been promoting a long-term and durable basis for mutually beneficial cooperation. No neighbouring country ought to feel threatened by any hostile action coming from Bulgarian territory. We continue to adjust our armed forces in full structural and quantitative conformity with the requirements of the principle of reasonable sufficiency for defence. We are resolved to implement our commitments under the Treaty on the reduction of conventional armed forces and armaments in Europe. Bulgaria wishes to see this Treaty benefiting from favourable conditions for the purpose of its ratification and entry into force. Bulgaria is interested in the negotiations on future reductions to continue on the basis of a new mandate. We hope that our partners in these negotiations will take into account the existence of certain asymmetries and military imbalances in the Balkan subregion. They have somehow been deepening of late.

My Government wishes to see in the remaining multilateral alliances a guarantee of its own security as well as the stability of various European subregions. We look upon confidence-building measures in Europe, and also in specific subregions, as an important means of strengthening security and stability in the continent. Bulgaria will also search for security guarantees on a broader international level. The latest international developments have shown how successful collective action on the part of the international community can be against aggression and the annexation of a small country. This new phenomenon strengthens our hopes in the triumph of a new and just world order in which the right to independence and the free development of all countries, be they small or big, will be guaranteed. Yes, we do believe that this is possible! Bulgaria lent its unreserved support to the actions of the multilateral forces in the Persian Gulf. The active Bulgarian participation in the United Nations efforts has been motivated by its belief in the world organization's ability to have an effective impact for the preservation of international peace and the security of individual Member States.

(Mr. Garvalov, Bulgaria)

My country has no ambition to discover or apply some new and unknown principles to achieve reliable security. In our view, the best guiding principle is the genuine desire to establish civilized relationships based on mutual recognition of the right to security and universal human values. Bulgaria wishes to state clearly and unequivocally: we do not seek, nor will we ever seek, security for ourselves alone; we do not seek security at the expense of others. We expect the same attitude on the part of our partners, and we will do our best to reach this objective.

In the foreseeable future arms control and disarmament will continue to occupy a central place among the various ways and means of ensuring Bulgaria's national security. Before I address some of the concrete items on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament, I would like to emphasize that the Bulgarian approach towards disarmament is no longer guided or motivated by political and ideological concepts that are already outdated. At the same time Bulgaria will retain the positive and constructive experience and cooperation we have had in that field.

Among the concrete items on the agenda my delegation attaches prime importance to the priority of the negotiations to conclude a chemical weapons convention. Bulgaria has declared that it does not possess chemical weapons, that it has no intention whatsoever of acquiring such weapons and that it is ready to sign the future convention immediately. My country has initiated the procedure whereby it will drop its reservations to the 1925 Geneva Protocol. While it is true in principle that negotiations are a give-and-take process, in this particular case Bulgaria is not giving up anything by joining such a convention. From the point of view of its national security Bulgaria can only gain from a convention which will eliminate all existing stocks of chemical weapons, prevent future production of chemical weapons and contain reliable guarantees that it will be strictly complied with, and may earn the widest possible adherence. For us this convention will be even more acceptable should it succeed in solving in the best possible and just way such issues as assistance, economic and technical cooperation in the field of civil chemical industry, and financial and organizational aspects.

Proceeding from these basic guidelines, the Bulgarian delegation will submit to this Conference the concrete position of the Bulgarian Government on the outstanding issues. Another important issue for us is that of "negative security guarantees". The way in which they have been tackled so far is reminiscent of another era. The sweeping changes in the international political climate are an encouragement to believe that this issue can be resolved. There is room for a fresh look and flexibility on the part of all States, both nuclear and non-nuclear. Bulgaria is satisfied that, following a protracted pause, it has become possible to set up a working body on the nuclear test ban. There is perhaps no other problem in the field of disarmament where the ink and the words have flowed so freely and in such quantities. May I just say that a comprehensive treaty banning all nuclear tests in all environments and for all time is achievable both in one step and in several steps? The Conference on Disarmament can and should play an active role in this process. There should be no obstacles in the way of the Conference. It will be advisable to concentrate all efforts on such an important aspect as verification, for instance.

(Mr. Garvalov, Bulgaria)

If a realistic approach is adopted, then a number of measures could be agreed upon in the field of confidence-building and openness in outer space activities. Bulgaria is also interested in the conclusion of an international convention on the prohibition of radiological weapons, as well as on the reliable protection of peaceful nuclear facilities. Many possibilities also exist for progress in other fields within the Conference's terms of reference. To conclude, let me say that Bulgaria will do everything within its power to further multilateral efforts in the field of disarmament, and that definitely means the Conference on Disarmament. My country will make use of all that is positive and constructive in its contribution to the work of this important forum. We shall definitely distance ourselves from the unrealistic positions which Bulgaria held at times in the past. We in Bulgaria are now transforming the country into a State where the rule of law and democracy is the ultimate objective and we shall not stray, I pray, from this path.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Russian): I thank His Excellency the First Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bulgaria for his important statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the distinguished representative of Nigeria, Ambassador Azikiwe.

Mr. AZIKIWE (Nigeria): Mr. President, my delegation is very pleased to see you presiding over our work during the final phase of the first part of our session. Your experience and outstanding diplomatic skills will no doubt assist the Conference to advance its work. Your distinguished predecessor, Ambassador Carl Magnus Hyltenius, deserves our appreciation for the very able manner in which he successfully conducted our work during his presidency. A number of colleagues have joined us since I last took the floor at the plenary. May I take this opportunity to welcome the Ambassadors of Algeria, Australia, Bulgaria, France, Poland and Yugoslavia? Furthermore, I would like to thank the First Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bulgaria for the honour he confers on our Conference by his presence this morning. We listened with great interest to his important statement.

At this time last year, the international community was buoyed with optimism that the world was on the verge of a new era of peace. That optimism has received a severe setback. Recent events in the Gulf clearly demonstrate that we are still living in a dangerous world. Yet another devasting war has ended, leaving in its wake enormous loss of lives and property. Threats to the international order are ever present, and the maintenance of international peace and security continues to be a never-ending struggle. The lesson for the international community is to remain vigilant and guard against complacency. Peace and security are never won for all time, but can be constructed on the basis of political choice and consensus within any region. We must strive to pre-empt rather than react to security threats. We must renew our commitment to the non-use of force and the resolution of international and regional problems as well as conflicts by peaceful means.

Arms transfer has become a disturbing phenomenon which must be addressed. In the continuing controversy, events in the Gulf with destabilizing global effects are partly the result of the unrestrained transfer of arms to an already volatile region. The events call for sober

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

reflection on the unbridled transfer of arms, particularly to regions of conflict. Instability in the third world has been further promoted by the requirement of some countries which have been subjected to acts of aggression to embark upon the acquisition of military potentials that they could certainly ill afford. Although previous efforts to place the control of arms transfers in the context of multilateral negotiations have failed, the time is now right for such consideration. The relationship between conventional arms and nuclear proliferation should be given careful attention. The increasing sophistication and destructive power of conventional weapons constitute ever-growing threats. The transfer to other regions of such weapons that will become superfluous as the result of disarmament agreements in the European arena poses the danger of escalation. Conventional disarmament must continue to be resolutely pursued within the context of overall global disarmament. Conventional disarmament in Europe should therefore lead to progress in other disarmament areas.

Security has always through history been the justification for the acquisition of weapons by States. The fear of military inferiority vis-à-vis a rival power has always fuelled competitive acquisition. The most obvious manifestion of the bipolar vision of the world has been the acquisition of nuclear weapons, and the body of doctrine built around it that incorporates the use of nuclear weapons. Even if one were a believer in primary deterrence, it is clear that this concept has now lost its relevance in the enhancement of security. The crucial question is whether these weapons which are supposed to have served the need of the past era have any relevance in the fundamentally changed political and security situation in Europe. The tremendous improvement in super-Power relations and the end of East-West idealogical rivalry no doubt gives great hope that the impetus for the nuclear arms race will be reversed. The outlook so far, however, is that the improved relations are likely to remove the pressure for accelerated nuclear disarmament negotiations. A sense of security based on the unlikelihood of a nuclear war between the super-Powers has already led to a loss of momentum and urgency in the START negotiations. Though super-Power cooperation is beneficial to regional problems, it has not and cannot eliminate them all. We must be determined to avoid taking one step forward and two steps backwards: one step forward in having the right political atmosphere, but two steps backwards by stifling multilateral efforts and denying ourselves what should have been the positive input of bilateral efforts. Nowhere has the need for global cooperation been more pressing than in disarmament. Regrettably nowhere also has the result been so dismal. The multifaceted problems of the world today are so complex that no single State or combination of a few States can presume to be able to dictate solutions. Such an approach would defer indefinitely the goal of achieving a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

In seeking to broaden the basis of the non-proliferation regime, therefore, greater attention will have to be paid to the issue of nuclear disarmament by all States, especially the nuclear-weapon States. As the START negotiations will result in only about a 30 per cent reduction, the remaining arsenals of the two super-Powers will still be far above the level of the other three nuclear-weapon States. The gap will be further compounded if modernization is to continue. Nuclear disarmament cannot be said to acquire a multilateral irreversible character until it involves all nuclear-weapon States

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

and all categories of nuclear weapons. It cannot be irreversible until there is a complete freeze on nuclear arsenals and a stop to modernization. Indeed, efforts to limit, reduce and eliminate such weapons are often outpaced by rapid scientific developments and the application of new technological advances to the fresh acquisition of weapons or qualitative refinement of earlier weapons. An indispensible measure in this respect, which should complement negotiations for deep reductions in nuclear arsenals and means of delivery, is the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Such a treaty will in the view of many, have the dual effect of impeding the evolution of a new generation of nuclear weapons as well as constraining those that wish to be newcomers to the nuclear weapons club.

At a time when the super-Powers have committed themselves to negotiated reductions of their nuclear arsenals on a continuous basis, it is incomprehensible that the rationale for a CTBT should be lost on them. It is a basic step forward towards a credible non-proliferation régime. The recently concluded Amendment Conference in New York provided an opportunity in this regard. Much as we cannot disguise our disappointment over the inability of the Amendment Conference to reach a consensus on the draft declaration, it would however be erroneous and misleading for anyone to conclude that it was a failure. Apart from being a significant landmark in the efforts of the international community to achieve a comprehensive test ban, it overwhelmingly voted "to mandate the President ... to conduct consultations with a view to achieving progress on those issues [verification and sanctions] and resuming the work of the Conference at an appropriate time". Indeed, the Amendment Conference is the strongest signal ever that the international community has sent to the nuclear-weapon States on the issue of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

In the Secretary-General's message to the Conference on 22 January he affirmed that "despite the differences in approach to the whole issue, there is overwhelming support on the part of Member States for a significant role by the Conference on Disarmament in dealing with the various aspects" of a nuclear test ban. Thus we believe that there is an obvious need to keep active this initiative in the immediate future, to take stock of those negotiations between sessions and give necessary political momentum at the appropriate time.

The spectre of the use of chemical weapons during the Gulf war has dramatically brought to the fore once again the need for the urgent conclusion of a convention on the comprehensive and total prohibition of chemical weapons. My delegation shares the concern within the CD and the rest of the international community over the delay in concluding the negotiations. The very high expectations that were generated by the Paris Conference on chemical weapons in January 1989 have yet to be realized. Our negotiations have reached a critical stage where the issues are now being addressed more purposefully than ever before. While my delegation appreciates and indeed respects the concerns of some delegations on a number of decisive issues under negotiation, our overriding consideration should be to ensure that we have a convention that members of the international community will be willing to adhere to and ratify. We therefore welcome the increasing attention paid in the Ad Hoc Committee to the question of universality. Similarly, it is

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

important for intensive consultations to be conducted regularly with non-members of the Conference on Disarmament, who do not have the opportunity to examine the provisions of the draft convention thoroughly and its effects on their national security.

My delegation is of the view that when the convention is finally concluded, it is essential to provide a genuine and credible guarantee to parties who do not produce or store chemical weapons in a way that will enhance rather than diminish the security of all States parties. These weapons of mass and indiscriminate destruction are morally reprehensible because their targets are not military installations or physical structures essential to military endeavour. They are always directed against innocent civilians and their environment. In practical terms, it means a convention that includes a very effective verification régime that will instil in States parties the confidence that its provisions are being complied with, or, where this is not so, that violations will be properly detected; a convention that will ensure that, where violations are detected, they will be decisively dealt with; a convention that will in particular be non-discriminatory among the States parties; a convention that will also foster cooperation among States parties, in the chemical industry. Similarly there is a need for genuine safeguards so that the principle of prohibition does not adversely affect chemical industries in the developing countries. My delegation is satisfied that the Ad Hoc Committee has got off to a good start this session under your able guidance. We expect the Committee to intensify its efforts to conclude outstanding work on the convention. The spirit of mutual concession and of mature compromise is required at this stage to overcome the outstanding differences.

We cannot help but register our profound regret that the Ad Hoc Committee on outer space does not have a negotiating mandate. The real question is: What should we do? We can go on as before, sitting it out and hoping that the fundamental problems some delegations do have might change. Or we can undertake constructive and courageous efforts in enriching the work of the Ad Hoc Committee. In this respect, my delegation welcomes the bold initiative of the Chairman, Ambassador García Moritán, in preparing a non-binding list that will enable us to embark on substantive consideration in a more practical way. We believe that the present legal régime is inadequate. Rapid advancement in science and technology has led to the development of new weapon systems unforeseen during the negotiation of the outer space Treaty and other relevant laws. There is so much that we can and must do. It is going to take a great deal of vision and political will on our part, especially from those who have the primary responsibility of preventing an arms race in outer space. The CD needs a breakthrough in real disarmament measures for the sake of maintaining its credibility as a negotiating forum. I believe that in this year's session we should avoid a "business as usual" approach. This is an approach which diffuses our attention on general discussions on all the issues, ending with no action on any. Rather, we should make this an action-oriented session in order to achieve concrete results.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Russian): I thank the distinguished representative of Nigeria for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to me. And I now give the floor to the distinguished representative of Japan, Ambassador Donowaki.

Mr. DONOWAKI (Japan): Mr. President, first of all I should like to express my sincere congratulations upon your assumption of the very important post of President of the Conference. I should also like to express appreciation to your predecessors, Ambassador Rasaputram and Ambassador Hyltenius for their very important contribution in setting us on the right track in our work. Since this is the first occasion for me to speak during this year's session, I should also like to welcome the newcomers among us, including the just arrived Ambassador of France, and I should also like to express appreciation for the presence here today of the First Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bulgaria. I listened with great interest to his important statement.

At the beginning of last year's session of the CD, our esteemed colleague from Brazil, Ambassador de Azambuja, provoked us by asking how our Conference, which is both structurally and conceptually a child of the cold war, can adapt to the new times. He was referring to the unsatisfactory state of our work in the CD - our failure to produce concrete achievements while super-Power bilateral and European regional East-West disarmament negotiations were harvesting achievements. The question posed here was of considerable importance. When the impasse due to the East-West confrontation was broken as a result of the ending of the cold war, various disarmament negotiations between the two super-Powers and the European East-West nations could achieve major breakthroughs one after another. In the CD, which is another important negotiating forum for disarmament, no concrete achievements on its agenda items emerged for more than a decade mainly because of the impasse due to the East-West confrontation. What is unfortunate about the CD is the fact that even after the easing of the East-West tension and the breaking of the impasse, it still fails to produce any concrete achievements. Why is this so? On this question we may be able to take either a pessimistic view or an optimistic view. If you take a pessimistic view, the argument may run as follows. The CD was created structurally and conceptually as a child of the cold war era. The presence of member States other than the Eastern and Western member States in the CD was a device to facilitate mediation of the East-West conflict on disarmament matters. However, the division was so great that no concrete agreements resulted. With the ending of the cold war, the Eastern and Western member States may be able to arrive at agreements without the help of the presence of other member States. Of course, the presence of other States will continue to be required, since the CD is a negotiating body for global and not only for East-West disarmament agreements. However, the failure of the CD so far even under the changed circumstances must be a signal that the CD should be reformulated to meet challenges and requirements of the emerging post-cold-war era.

I, for myself, do not subscribe to such a pessimistic view. The view of an optimist would go as follows. One should show a little more patience about the pace of work in the CD. The ending of the cold war is already bringing about major breakthroughs in the work of the CD. It is only due to the inherent complexity of the task of the CD, which is to produce global agreements not limited to the East-West context, and also the professional and circumspect approach the CD takes as compared with the more politically oriented approach in East-West negotiations, that concrete achievements by the CD tend to lag behind other negotiations. As to the need for the

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

reformulation and reorientation of the CD to meet the requirements of the new times, a thorough and intensive review will certainly be required. However, in the mean time there is no reason to consider the CD as it is now to be seriously hampered in functioning properly in this very crucial time of transition, since most of the key countries and regions of the world today are already well represented in the CD. Furthermore, if there are any nations who think they should be in the CD, they can participate in the work of the CD as observer States.

The optimistic view about the work of the CD that I have just described can be substantiated by taking a careful look at the status of the chemical weapons convention negotiations. It was in 1984, when the United States introduced a draft convention in CD/500, that the concept of mandatory inspections or inspections on request took firm hold as an important mechanism for ensuring the reliability and effectiveness of the CWC. In 1987, as a result of President Gorbachev's "new thinking" diplomacy, the Soviet Union came to support the concept of mandatory inspections. This was already the beginning of the end of the cold war, from which the CWC negotiations received a tremendous boost. Two years later, when the CD still had no CWC and the Iran-Iraq war produced unfortunate instances of the use of chemical weapons, the Paris Conference was convened in January 1989, and then the Canberra Conference later in the same year, in order to encourage the early conclusion of the CWC. The year 1990 was regarded as a critical year for the negotiations. The signing in June of that year of the bilateral United States-Soviet agreement to cease production of CW and to destroy most of their CW stockpiles was indeed a historic step forward, immensely facilitating the CWC negotiations. On the other hand, one has to admit the enormous impact the new concept of inspection on request had in store, because it was to be applied globally, in contrast to the CFE Treaty, which applied only to Europe, and also because it was meant to involve not only military but also civilian industrial facilities. The complexity and sensitivity of the issue was clearly demonstrated when the United States and the Soviet Union failed to agree on the protocol on inspection procedures at the end of last year, in spite of their commitment to do so. Thus it becomes clear that the CD cannot be criticized for its incompetence, or for its failure to take advantage of the ending of the cold war.

Another important factor delaying the negotiations last year was the debate on the question of the universality of the future CWC. In last year's United States-Soviet bilateral agreement, it was agreed that the concept of a residual security stock would be introduced into the draft CWC in order to ensure universal adherence to the future convention. However, the proposal, which amounted to the creation of unequal status for States parties to the future convention between CW haves and have-nots, was bound to be met with strong opposition and resentment from a number of States participating in the negotiations.

I took up the issue of inspections upon request and the issue of universality as the most important issues on which the CWC negotiations were stalled during the course of last year. However, I did not do so out of despair. On the contrary, my delegation was encouraged by the fact that the most crucial issues finally came to be seriously and constructively discussed

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

during the course of last year under the able chairmanship of your predecessor, Ambassador Carl-Magnus Hyltenius. Similarly, some other remaining issues of importance were tackled energetically and considerable progress was achieved during the course of last year. This year my delegation is pleased to note the prevailing sense among delegations that we are nearing our final goal. The crucial issues of inspection upon request and universal adherence, as well as other similarly important remaining issues, are now being actively pursued under your dedicated and skilful chairmanship of the Ad Hoc Committee. Working group chairmen and friends of the chair selected by you are also demonstrating devotion and competence. In addition, group co-ordinators are working harder than ever. All these indications show that the momentum is rising. Formal and informal consultations, as well as group and bilateral consultations, are fully geared up to the early achievement of our common goal. Therefore, my delegation does not find it necessary to dwell upon any specific issues in today's plenary statement, except to reaffirm its strong commitment to work, under your able guidance, for the early conclusion of the CWC. I also wish to take this opportunity to remind the Conference that Japan, like the CSCE member States, declared its intention to become one of the original signatory States of the CWC last October during the session of the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly.

The second issue I wish to take up today in connection with the role of the CD in the changing world of today is the question of a nuclear test ban. The establishment last year of the Ad Hoc Committee on this issue, and its subsequent re-establishment this year, represented a truly significant change in the attitude of CD delegations, as compared to the preceding seven years' sterile impasse. Of course, this was due to the spirit of compromise and flexibility demonstrated by all the groups and delegations of the CD. My delegation was particularly pleased to see that after the fourth NPT review conference in September last year, and after the PTBT Amendment Conference of January this year, the same spirit prevailed again in the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee.

In spite of recent remarkable achievements in the United States-Soviet nuclear testing talks, slow progress towards a comprehensive test ban has over the years been a source of strong discontent among a number of non-nuclear-weapon States, and in order to apply international pressure for the early realization of a CTB, a confrontational approach might have been a natural choice. In the CD also, when the establishment of an ad hoc committee was considered in the last few years, delegations were divided into two camps, one refusing to begin the work if it was a negotiation and the other refusing to do so unless it was a negotiation. Such a stalemate now appears to have been overcome thanks to the spirit of compromise and flexibility. Furthermore, my delegation was pleased to note that, under the skilful chairmanship of Ambassador Chadha, the NTB Ad Hoc Committee appears to be getting down to business - to the business of having a meaningful dialogue. Indeed, it is my delegation's belief that once we are engaged in a dialogue, and succeed in deepening common understanding on the nature of a nuclear test ban, we should be able to work out together a satisfactory solution to the problem based upon such a common understanding. On the other hand, although Japan stands for nuclear disarmament and for the early realization of a CTB, Japan is of the opinion that since the question of a CTB is a very complex and

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

delicate matter involving the security of nations, its realization will have to be on a step-by-step basis. On this and other points of importance, my delegation has been and will continue to be expressing its views in the NTB Ad Hoc Committee in more detail. My delegation wishes to reiterate its expectation that the substantive work resumed in the Ad Hoc Committee will prove to be successful and fruitful, leading us ultimately to a satisfactory solution of this long-standing historic issue.

When we think about the role of the CD in the emerging post-cold-war era, we are all aware that the end of East-West confrontation does not necessarily lead us to a more peaceful and stable world. The unfortunate experience of the Gulf war reminded us of the danger of even more frequent and disastrous regional conflicts. Therefore, the greatest concern of our times is the question of whether and how we can prevent a second and third incident similar to the one Iraq unlawfully started. In this connection, the question of the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, as well as the question of the abnormal build-up of conventional weapons in particular regions, are likely to be focused upon with great attention at every possible opportunity in our international dealings. The relevance of the CD as the sole multilateral negotiating body on disarmament matters will certainly be judged by its ability to meet the concerns of our times as described above. As far as the prevention of weapons of mass destruction is concerned, the early conclusion of the CWC will no doubt become the single most important contribution by the CD for the time being, while any much longer delay in delivering the CWC will cast serious doubt on the competence of the CD. As to biological weapons, a number of delegations appear to take the view that the updating of the BWC by incorporating a workable and reliable verification mechanism would be a natural and urgent task for the CD after the conclusion of the CWC. As for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, we have in place the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty and the strengthening of the Treaty régime, we have to admit, is not under the responsibility of the CD alone. As to the question of the abnormal build-up of conventional arms in particular regions, the dangers of which we have been reminded of by the latest events in the Gulf, Japan, as a nation that has long enforced a policy of strict control on arms exports, may be in a good position to urge other major suppliers of arms to exercise restraint. However, arms export control is a well-known complex problem. Denial of arms supplies might have a destabilizing effect on those regions where the existing imbalance of forces poses a real threat to the security of some nations in the region. Furthermore, mere restraint in arms transfer naturally works in favour of nations with an arms production capability. In any case, it remains to be seen whether the question of international arms transfers can best be addressed at the CD. On the other hand, we may be able to make a modest step forward by enhancing transparency and openness in international arms transfers. This is one of the so-called confidence-building measures. It has to be applied globally, and still it has great relevance to regional security problems. Furthermore, a study on the question of transparency in international arms transfers now being conducted by a group of experts under the auspices of the United Nations is scheduled to be completed this summer. Although confidence-building measures are not disarmament per se, there is no doubt about their usefulness in preventing an arms race, and the CD must be the right forum for looking into the matter with a view to working out appropriate international undertakings. In this way the CD may become more attuned to the requirements of our times.

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

When we take a look at our agenda in the CD as adopted (CD/1049), we realize that as many as three items are nuclear-related and that pertinent issues including the BWC are not given any place. Of course, my delegation recognizes the importance of a nuclear test ban, and will continue to work hard for its early realization. None the less, there is no denying that the idea of giving this agenda item such high priority was a by-product of the culmination of the cold war era. Some 10 years ago when there was no realistic possibility of a reduction in nuclear arms, a nuclear test ban, however unachievable it might actually have been, might have had its own appeal as the most important step forward in the direction of nuclear disarmament. Today we find ourselves, let us hope, in a vastly different world. My delegation is aware that the agenda of the CD has its own history. Often it is explained that our agenda is based on the famous "Decalogue", which in turn is said to have taken into account the relevant provisions of the documents of SSOD I and II. Then the question may arise: How come the Decalogue appears to be more flexible, allowing more room for the inclusion of the urgent subjects of our times, including the BWC, as agenda items of the CD? It is against this background that my delegation was pleased to see the resumption of the informal open-ended consultations on the improved and effective functioning of the CD under the chairmanship of our esteemed colleague, Ambassador Kamal of Pakistan. In this fast-changing world, the CD must certainly work hard to meet the requirements of our times by concluding, as early as possible, the long-standing CWC negotiations, and by placing on its agenda the most appropriate and urgently required items of our times.

Lastly, my delegation wishes to draw the attention of the Conference to the fact that the Government of Japan issued a statement yesterday entitled "Japanese near-term responses to the problems in the Middle East". It contains a section on arms control and disarmament. Since the statement clarifies the official position of my Government on some of the issues I took up in my intervention, copies of an English translation of the statement are being distributed to all delegations.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Russian): I thank the distinguished representative of Japan for his statement and for his kind words addressed to me. I now give the floor to the distinguished representative of Venezuela, Ambassador Arteaga.

Mr. ARTEAGA (Venezuela) (translated from Spanish): At the outset, Sir, I should like to extend to you the expression of our pleasure at seeing you presiding over the work of the Conference on Disarmament. Your wealth of experience, your wide-ranging knowledge of disarmament issues and your recognized ability are the best guarantee that, under your guidance, our work will be productive and constructive. We should also like to place on record our congratulations and our gratitude both to Ambassador Rasaputram and to Ambassador Hyltenius of Sweden for the skilful and effective way in which they conducted the work of the Conference in past weeks. We should also like to welcome the Ambassadors of Algeria, Australia, Bulgaria, France, Poland and Yugoslavia, who have recently joined the work of the Conference.

Incontestably, the political developments that have occurred in Eastern and Central Europe have reaffirmed the importance of some of the concepts and principles guiding the conduct of the United Nations since 1945 as a factor of

(Mr. Arteaga, Venezuela)

equilibrium and stability in the difficult process of international relations, namely respect for human rights, self-determination of peoples and the expansion of the concept of international security. Of course these developments and the acceptance of new perceptions of international politics have made it possible to overcome the cold war structure as a political model of the international system. As the promising potentialities offered by events in Europe were being evaluated, the international community was confronted with a difficult and hazardous Gulf crisis that prompted a firm and resolute response.

In the light of the relaxation in Soviet-American relations, we have heard statements regarding the need to make progress in moulding a new international order. We are convinced that the emergence of a new world structure should be based on balance, and on recognition of the role which each of the organs in the United Nations system should play for international peace and security, without establishing a hierarchy amongst them. Though it is true that the Security Council has been strengthened as a consequence of the profound and rapid transformations experienced in the international area and through the Gulf crisis, it is no less true that these changes should act as a catalyst to revitalize the work of the Conference on Disarmament and render it more effective, as well as the work of other United Nations bodies. Likewise we believe that the future international order should not rest on the special interests of a small group of countries, as this situation could lead in a negative way to the formation of a limited international system disregarding the general interest of the international community regarding the major challenges it should confront. We cannot conceal that the political developments have far outrun the cautious pace of negotiations on arms control and disarmament, and partly as a result the validity of military doctrines is now being practically questioned as regards their existence. Consequently there is an urgent need for these doctrines to be replaced by appropriate structures which make possible the rapid elimination of the old antagonistic approaches which have persisted for over 40 years.

One of the paramount items before the Conference on Disarmament relates to the nuclear test ban. The most effective way of achieving this goal, which all share, lies in the signature of a treaty on this issue. The continuation of nuclear testing could have an adverse affect on efforts aimed at strengthening the legal non-proliferation régime. That turns this question into one of the most complex challenges the international community must confront during this decade. The signature of a treaty containing a general and complete ban on these tests would be beneficial to the international system, since this measure would act as a political deterrent to any initiative by a State or group of States aimed at increasing horizontal proliferation with its inherent dangers. If, however, these tests continue to be carried out, they would undoubtedly offer some non-nuclear States the political excuse to remain aloof from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which in turn would confirm the discriminatory nature that a good number of States ascribe to it.

We are convinced that the maintenance of the policy of nuclear testing should not shelter behind the alleged need to guarantee the reliability, effectiveness and safety of nuclear arsenals, or the inadequacies of current verification measures. In our view these arguments or excuses constitute

(Mr. Arteaga, Venezuela)

dilatory tactics that seek to sidestep a security goal shared by all States. Consequently, we believe that delays on this issue would undermine the future international order to which we all aspire. The signature of a treaty of this kind would generate a positive impact on the reversal of the arms race. As regards the non-proliferation Treaty, we believe that its substantive extension after 1995 will obviously be linked to the enactment of that disarmament measure in the short term, as was reflected in the negotiations at the fourth review conference.

In order to complement the work of this body, and without attempting to disregard the paramount responsibility devolving upon the Conference on Disarmament, Venezuela, along with five other nations, urged the holding of the recent conference to amend the 1963 partial test-ban Treaty with the firm resolve to seek compromise formulas designed to eradicate that practice. In putting forward this type of proposal, we were prompted by a constructive spirit based on principles set forth in the Treaty itself. On behalf of the six States which sponsored the amendment proposal, the delegation of Mexico submitted document CD/1054, containing a draft of protocol II on verification of the amendment we proposed to the Treaty. We hope that the Ad Hoc Committee will give this document proper consideration. In the same context, the delegation of Venezuela welcomes the declaration of Foz do Iguaçú adopted on 28 November 1990 by the Presidents of Argentina and Brazil, in which the two heads of State reiterated their countries' readiness to use nuclear energy solely for peaceful purposes, the desire to promote the full entry into force of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco), and the possible signature of a safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency, with its positive impact as regards verification. Certainly this type of political event once again reaffirms the conviction and commitment of Latin America to non-proliferation and disarmament.

It is indisputable that the international community has agreed to preserve and conserve outer space for exclusively peaceful purposes and for the benefit of all mankind. Even though it is recognized that weapons have not been deployed in space, there are certain weapons or systems of such weapons that could be placed in that environment. We observe that the talks on strategic nuclear weapons carried out by the United States and the Soviet Union have not succeeded in reaching a solution to the problem of the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and the creation of new defensive systems. It seems that the discussion on the relationship between offensive and defensive weapons is designed to legitimize the deployment of defensive strategic systems, in any environment, including outer space. The 1967 Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies is in force. We have all recognized that this instrument plays a very important role in regulating activities related to outer space. What was not foreseen at the time when it was negotiated and entered into force was the possibility that strategic defence weapons and systems might be developed which could operate in space, from space or towards space. Hence the repeated assertion on numerous occasions that the legal régime applicable to space is inadequate to effectively prevent an arms race in this environment, and it is for this reason that we have also affirmed the need to negotiate specific measures designed to prevent an arms race in space. For six years, the

(Mr. Arteaga, Venezuela)

Ad Hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space has been operating and has been considering the item. In many respects, over these years, the Committee has played a useful role which is reflected in the reports on its work. From the work done by the Committee, it can be concluded that the stage of general and substantive consideration of the various issues related to the prevention of an arms race in outer space, as well as the existing legal régime, has already been passed.

From now on, it is necessary to focus all efforts on the identification and drawing up of specific measures to achieve the central goal of item 5 of the agenda of the Conference, which is precisely to prevent an arms race in outer space. The proposals which have been submitted on specific measures offer a sound basis for carrying out this work through careful consideration of them, identifying areas of agreement or convergence and orienting the work of the Committee towards action. This set of proposals includes a proposal submitted by Venezuela for an amendment to article IV of the 1967 space Treaty to change the scope of this Treaty from a partial ban into a total ban. This is, if you will, a "positive" assessment of the work of the Committee, and hence we are even more perplexed at the fact that no progress has been achieved in the consideration of measures designed effectively to prevent an arms race in outer space.

Among the items included in its agenda, there is one on which the Conference on Disarmament has made progress in fulfilling its role as a multilateral negotiating body. Let us say that this is the only one on which we have made progress - the issue of chemical weapons. The process of negotiation on the draft convention has been arduous. Many persistent obstacles in the past negotiations have been overcome. Proof of this is the current content of appendices I and II to the "rolling text" of the draft convention. The draft convention sets forth the commitment of all States parties not to use, develop, produce, acquire, stock-pile, retain or transfer chemical weapons, as well as the commitment to their destruction. The scope of the convention is quite clear: the total and complete destruction of chemical weapons. Bearing in mind that there is a prohibition of use contained in the Geneva Protocol of 1925 - a question that has been incorporated in the scope of the future convention - we are concerned that this reference has not yet been included in the mandate of the Committee. Also included is a clear commitment to the total destruction of chemical weapons over a 10-year period. Recognizing this commitment and the scope of the Convention, which is that of total prohibition and destruction, provisions which ensure the maintenance of certain CW arsenals at the end of the destruction period would be unacceptable at this stage of the negotiations. In that context, we reiterate that the fundamental element which must characterize this instrument is that of universality, and to achieve this the scope set by the convention should be that of total and complete prohibition and destruction, establishing no rights for chemical-weapon States to maintain certain arsenals, nor any postponement of the obligation to destroy all chemical weapons as well as CW production facilities. An issue requiring consideration by the Committee relates to the financing of the organization for the prohibition of chemical weapons.

Last year Working Group C held consultations on this issue, the results of which are currently attached in appendix 2 of the "rolling text". The inclusion of a reference on this item in the draft convention is an important

(Mr. Arteaga, Venezuela)

step which will make the future work of the Committee easier. The negotiation of a Convention to establish a total ban on chemical weapons, which has involved the consideration of a number of political and technical issues of extreme complexity, and major efforts and sacrifices on the part of the negotiators, has proved that the Conference can make progress in multilateral negotiations when there is political will to do so. The time would be right if we take into account the proposal for the holding of a ministerial session of the Conference on Disarmament devoted to the chemical weapons issue. Presumably this conference would be designed to overcome the obstacles affecting the negotiations on the convention. However, at the same time we believe that we cannot come to this session with the same problems as those which exist now, and hence we have to focus our efforts on overcoming them and to hold the conference at the time deemed most appropriate. A modest contribution by Venezuela to the efforts designed to achieve the complete prohibition of chemical weapons is the holding in Caracas of a regional seminar which will basically revolve around the question of chemical weapons. This seminar will be held from 1 to 5 July of the current year. The seminar, as we have previously stated, will be designed to acquaint all Latin American and Caribbean States with the scope, the purposes and goals of the convention, the verification machinery that is to be set up, and generally speaking all the legal and technical aspects of the future convention on chemical weapons in order to facilitate the internal administrative and legislative process that is to be followed for the early ratification, entry into force and implementation of this instrument. It is hoped that the participating Governments will give preference to designating officials from their foreign ministries or other governmental bodies who in one way or another would participate in decision-making relating to the adoption and setting in motion of the convention.

An item increasingly requiring the special attention of the international community relates to the protection of the environment. The arms race in its use of technology, the manufacture and use of certain types of weapons, has had serious repercussions in this field. A clear example is the case of continued nuclear testing. We also have the example of accidents such as that which occurred in the nuclear plant at Chernobyl, which had adverse consequences for the natural environment and compels us to seek energy efficiency and the development of safer sources. Another example that caused serious damage to the environment in the Middle East region is the destruction of oil wells during the Gulf war.

Among measures designed to achieve disarmament use must be made of a series of methods which can have equally serious impacts on the ecological system, such as the application of various systems for the destruction of weapons, the transport of weapons for that purpose, waste treatment and the destruction of production facilities, among others. Hence we consider that the measures taken should include provisions guaranteeing the protection of the environment. Of relevance in this respect, in our view, and in the specific case of chemical weapons, is the proposal submitted by the delegation of Peru for the inclusion of an article in the draft convention setting forth a commitment by the States parties to the convention to take the necessary steps to ensure that the preservation and cleaning up of the environment is regarded as a priority task in the implementation of the convention.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Russian): I thank the distinguished representative of Venezuela for his statement and for his kind words addressed to me. That concludes my list of speakers for today, and I would like to ask if whether any of the distinguished representatives wishes to take the floor. I see that the distinguished representative of France, Ambassador Errera, has asked for the floor.

Mr. ERRERA (France) (translated from French): I would very simply like to thank you, Mr. President, for the very kind words of welcome that you addressed to me. It goes without saying that for me it is a great honour and pleasure to represent my country in this Conference and to join this eminent assembly which is both a witness to and a protagonist in the changes or upheavals that are affecting international equilibria. To join it at a time when disarmament issues are acquiring a new dimension, issues related to disarmament and arms control, and when they have perhaps never been so present. To join it at the moment when you have been called upon to preside over our work, and on that occasion allow me to wish you every success in your important duties. I would also like to thank you for what you said about my predecessor and friend, Pierre Morel, I know what contribution he made to the work of the Conference. He will therefore be particularly grateful for the message which I will convey to him. I know, too, that Pierre Morel would not have been able to discharge his duties here successfully without the trust and friendship of all - the member countries, the Secretary-General, the Deputy Secretary-General, the secretariat - and you may be sure that I will be determined to promote and consolidate that spirit of trust. Thus I would like to assure you and all the members of the Conference of my readiness and that of my delegation, while upholding the views and positions of my country, to spare no effort to move forward in our negotiations. I will do so with the ambition that is required by the importance of the stakes, but I will do so also with the modesty that is called for by the complex nature of the issues that we have to resolve.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Russian): I thank the distinguished representative of France for his statement and wish to ask once again if there is anyone else wishing to take the floor before we move on to certain organizational matters. I see no one else wishes to take the floor.

As I have already indicated in my introductory remarks, as a result of the efforts of my predecessors as President of the Conference on Disarmament, the work on practically all topics is on the right track, and we have a relatively small number of issues, essentially organizational in nature, which may require our attention during my presidency. These issues are well known to all of us, and so I will refer to them only briefly.

First of all, the dates of the next session of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to detect and identify seismic events. You will recall that Ambassador Hyltenius, my predecessor, informed the Conference that further consultations would be required before we were in a position to take a decision on this question. Those consultations have not yet been concluded, and I intend to follow up on this issue in the weeks to come.

The second matter that I wish to draw to your attention relates to the consultations to enhance the effectiveness of the work of the Conference as you know, informal open-ended consultations on this matter were held under the

(The President)

leadership of Ambassador Kamal last Tuesday, and further consultations will be conducted during the second half of the annual session. For the time being, obviously, there is no need to revert to this question.

Next, as you also know, the distinguished representative of Mexico, Ambassador Miguel Marín Bosch, has been appointed special co-ordinator and mandated to seek agreement on an appropriate organizational framework under agenda item 8, namely the comprehensive programme of disarmament. It is my understanding that Ambassador Marín Bosch is currently engaged in consultations on this matter, and we will be informed about the results as soon as those results are arrived at.

And, lastly, the question of the composition of the Conference on Disarmament. You also know very well that my predecessor, Ambassador Hylteniu[illegible], undertook consultations on this very important and very delicate issue. In pursuance of my duties as President, it is my intention to continue those consultations on this subject.

Those were the matters that I wished to draw to the attention of the distinguished representatives. And now I would like to invite you all to take a look at the timetable of meetings to be held by the Conference and its subsidiary bodies next week. That timetable was distributed at my request by the secretariat of the Conference. The timetable includes meetings up to 28 March, when we shall conclude the first part of the annual session. I would also like to draw to your attention the fact that the programme of work for the coming week schedules two plenary meetings, in accordance with the agreement reached last year. Of course, the schedule is, as usual, merely indicative, and is subject to change if the need arises. If there are no objections, I will take it that the Conference adopts this timetable.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Russian): As agreed by the Conference in the timetable of meetings for this week, immediately after our plenary meeting we shall hold an informal meeting devoted to the substance of agenda item 2.

I have no other business for today, and therefore I now intend to adjourn this plenary meeting. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held next Tuesday, 26 March at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at noon.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.589
26 March 1991

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FIVE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-NINTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 26 March 1991, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Serguei B. Batsanov (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)

GE.91-60593/5891a

The PRESIDENT (translated from Russian): I declare open the 589th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

There are no speakers on the list for today. However, in accordance with Conference practice I would like to ask whether any delegation wishes to take the floor at the present stage.

Allow me to remind you that on Thursday 28 March at 10 a.m. we shall be holding the last plenary meeting of the first part of the annual session. I hope that we will be able to start the meeting punctually, since we will have a high-ranking visitor who will address the Conference then.

I now intend to close our plenary meeting.

The meeting rose at 10.20 a.m.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.590
28 March 1991

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FIVE HUNDRED AND NINETIETH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 28 March 1991, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Serguei B. Batsanov (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)

GE.91-60599/9823A

The PRESIDENT (translated from Russian): I declare open the 590th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament. Today I have on my list of speakers the distinguished representative of Zaire, Mr. Mantuba, to whom I should now like to give the floor.

Mr. MANTUBA (Zaire) (translated from French): Mr. President, allow me to extend to you my warm congratulations upon your election to the head of the Conference on Disarmament for the month of March. We hope that your cognitive skills and your qualities as an outstanding diplomat will be placed at the disposal of the Conference for its smooth running. My congratulations also go to the eminent ambassadors of Sweden, Mr. Hyltenius, and Sri Lanka, Mr. Rasaputram, who, thanks to their intelligence, dedication and diplomatic experience, have enabled the Conference to attain certain substantial results to which our Conference aspires. To all the new ambassadors who have joined the family of the Conference on Disarmament I wish good luck and every success in the discharge of their functions.

Mr. President, your country, the Soviet Union, one of the super-Powers of the world, has excellent diplomatic relations with my country, Zaire. We hope that the presence of a super-Power at the head of our presidency will settle many of the problems that sometimes paralyse the smooth functioning of our Conference.

The world has just experienced a painful crisis that led to the loss of several human lives; I refer to the Gulf conflict. During this dramatic period Zaire, my country, occupied the presidency of the Security Council and performed those functions in a worthy manner. As can be seen, the Gulf crisis was the most severe test that the international community has faced since the end of the Second World War. Practically all the States of the world condemned Iraq's aggression against Kuwait. My country's diplomatic contribution played a very outstanding role. We wished to side with those States that were determined to defend and re-establish the sovereignty of a State attacked and annexed by a neighbouring country belonging to the Non-Aligned Movement. It was in this context that Zaire supported all the resolutions voted by the Security Council to re-establish and rehabilitate international law.

Nobody is unaware of the fact that arms have spoken in the Middle East and more especially in the Gulf. The most diabolical military arsenal since the end of the Second World War was used at last to apply the resolutions of the world organization which in the past were reviled by those very persons who had helped to set it up. The Gulf war also enabled the highly industrialized States to test the efficiency and sophistication of their weapons. Militarily speaking the Gulf conflict has taught us the wrong strategic lesson. Far from believing in a rapid policy of disarmament, this war, if the strategists of the policy of international equilibrium do not take care, will create a regrettable precedent and will indeed accentuate the arms proliferation race. Such a proliferation, based not only on strategic but rather on mercantilist objectives, will be a serious monumental aberration for mankind, since it will further encourage competition between manufacturing industries in arms-producing countries.

(Mr. Mantuba, Zaire)

My country is happy to see the USSR, one of the world's military super-Powers, now occupying the Chair of the Conference. We hope that the political influence of your State will play an important role to move the progress of our work forward and, if possible, to succeed in laying certain new foundations that will enable the Conference to sign at the very least a treaty on one of the items on the agenda. To my mind the Conference on Disarmament seems to be sick, suffering from an illness that is difficult to cure. There can be no cure as long as the interlinked interests of all the militarily well-armed States are at stake. These stakes prevent the major Powers from concluding treaties and conventions on the various items on the agenda of our Conference. If we are not in a position to reach this point, it would be desirable to revert to the proposal made last year here in the plenary by the eminent Ambassador of Peru, Mr. Oswaldo de Rivero, who said:

> "In view of this new context in world history, with the rituals of our work, it would be preferable for the Conference on Disarmament to pause and reflect. It is a matter of knowing whether the Conference on Disarmament is capable of taking into account the changes that have occurred on the world scene or whether it is going to confine itself to reshuffing its old ideas."

In my humble opinion the Conference has neither reflected nor paused to see to what extent the changes that have occurred could reorient our Organization. Just recently, the regret expressed by the august representative of Peru, Dr. Calderón, on the Conference's inability, over a period of nearly 12 years, to conclude even a treaty on one of the items on the agenda, shows sufficiently well the seriousness of the illness from which our Conference is suffering. But if we really cannot perform the main function for which this organ was created, what can be its justification? Unless we are careful, the Conference on Disarmament runs the risk of becoming a debating society for plenipotentiaries whose main purpose is merely to set forth and highlight their different points of view. How could you explain that to this day we are still in the midst of doubts and hesitations and consultations to find a decisive solution concerning the expansion of the membership of the Conference? It is, moreover, surprising to find that certain States are opposed to increasing the number of members from 39 to 44. It is high time for the Conference to be flexible on this subject; because our common aim is to bring about a new network of international security relationships where each State, big or small, must make its modest contribution. Whether members, observers or others, every time world peace is threatened, all world States experience a lack of security and all have the same concern - peace. It is true that the Conference's overall record is not totally negative; for it is agreeable to acknowledge the establishment of certain ad hoc committees on a few items on the agenda. But what course will they take, and what will their aim be? For instance, taking agenda item 1 on nuclear testing, the eminent Ambassador of Morocco, Mr. Benhima, was among the outstanding speakers last year who deplored the fact that the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban did not have a negotiating mandate. I am afraid that this year the situation will be almost identical. Nothing will surprise us when we bear in mind that the interests of these five major nuclear-weapon Powers are closely connected. As regards chemical weapons, as everybody knows, their history is the longest

(Mr. Mantuba, Zaire)

in all multilateral negotiations on disarmament. Sixty-five years after the adoption of the Geneva Protocol in 1925, the international community still has no convention banning all chemical weapons. What has become of the enthusiasm generated by the 1989 Paris Conference on the convention banning the production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons? As time passes, all the speeches, promises and initiatives seem today to have evaporated into the clouds, and the threat of their use remains. Where is the political resolve of the international community?

Mr. President, the peace and security of the world is in the hands of the Soviet Union and the United States of America. You alone hold the most threatening and the most deadly quantity on Earth. Your country, the Soviet Union, possesses a gigantic military machine, which imposes a crushing burden on the world scene. The same is true of the United States, which in geopolitical terms is still the only military, economic, political and ideological super-Power on Earth. Western Europe and Japan have known economic success; exploiting its size and demographic power, China makes use of it as an element of political influence. All these factors make you inevitable protagonists in all aspects of world power. This singularity imposes on you a heavy responsibility in building the future of the world in general and that of the Conference on Disarmament in particular.

As for the third world countries, which are used to being left on the sidelines by the major Powers, they are always cast in the role of poor relations. I think that the time has come to put the clocks right and to take account of the importance and the contributions of all States. Otherwise our Conference will not be able to attain the objectives it has set itself. That will be a major risk, not to say political suicide which could lead us towards the path of slaughter.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Russian): I thank the distinguished representative of Zaire for his statement and for his kind words concerning my country, the good relations between Zaire and the USSR and also myself. Before proceeding with other business I should like to know whether any other delegation would like to take the floor at this stage. I see none.

As you know, this is the last plenary meeting of the first part of the annual session. In order to ensure that no time is wasted in the organization of our work at the opening of the second part, I have requested the secretariat to distribute today the timetable of meetings to be held by the Conference and its subsidiary bodies during the first week of that session. As indicated in the timetable, work will be resumed on Tuesday, 14 May. I wish to note that the plenary meeting to be held on Thursday, 16 May will start at 11 a.m. rather than at 10 a.m. as is the custom. There are already two high-level visitors on the list of speakers for that day, and in order to facilitate the organizational arrangements relating to one of these visits we shall proceed as indicated. It goes without saying that the timetable now proposed for your attention is merely indicative and can be changed if necessary. On that customary understanding I recommend its adoption. If there are no objections we shall proceed in that manner.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Russian): I would like to draw your attention to one other point. In accordance with rule 11 of the rules of procedure, I invited the group co-ordinators to distribute for consideration at the meetings of the groups held yesterday morning the draft of a letter to be addressed by me to the Director-General of the United Nations Office at Geneva concerning parking in the inner courtyard of the Palais des Nations. So far the groups have raised no objections to the text under consideration. I have conducted bilateral consultations with some delegations that have made comments; as a result of those consultations an understanding was reached that the text of the letter would remain unchanged. Accordingly I shall proceed to send the letter as drafted.

Now, with your permission, I would like to take the floor myself as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons to make a brief announcement. At the last meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons we agreed that the documents submitted by the chairmen of the working groups and the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee would be compiled by the secretariat, naturally without their being given any official status or document number. I would now like to inform delegations that this compilation will be put in the delegations' pigeon-holes on Tuesday, 2 April. In that way everyone will be able to obtain those documents there at that time.

I have no other business that I would like to put before you today, and if there is no one wishing to speak I would like to inform you that, in accordance with the timetable of meetings for this week, after this plenary meeting the Conference will hold an informal meeting devoted to the substance of agenda item 3.

I now intend to adjourn this plenary meeting. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Thursday, 16 May, at 11 a.m. In a few minutes we will resume our work in an informal meeting.

The meeting rose at 10.30 a.m.